

IN THE MATTER OF
Rodriques
VS
Delta Air Lines, Inc.

Transcript of Deposition of
Barbara A. Franz

Volume I
On December 11, 2014

*Reported by Joel P. Moyer
Certified Court Reporter*


**DONOVAN REPORTING
& VIDEO CONFERENCING**
237 Roswell Street Marietta, GA 30060
770.499.7499 800.547.1512 FAX: 770.428.5801
www.donovanreporting.com

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

JERRICK J. RODRIQUES,
Plaintiff,

vs. CASE NO. 1:14-cv-12707-BAF-DRG

DELTA AIR LINES, INC.,
Defendant.

— — —

Deposition of BARBARA A. FRANZ,

Taken by Felicia Duncan Brock,

Before Joel P. Moyer,
Certified Court Reporter,

At the Offices of
Delta Air Lines General Offices,
Atlanta, Georgia,

On Thursday, December 10, 2014,
Beginning at 8:53 a.m. & ending at 1:44 p.m.

— — —

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

2

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL

2 For the Plaintiff:

3 FELICIA DUNCAN BROCK
4 IAB Attorneys At Law PLLC
5 25447 Plymouth Road
Redford, MI 48239
313.318.3180

6 For the Defendant:

7 RICHARD M. TUYN
8 Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak &
Stewart PC
9 Suite 300
34977 Woodward Avenue
Birmingham, MI 48009
10 248.593.6400

11 KELLY K. GIUSTINA
RYAN D. LANGE
12 Delta Air Lines Inc.
1030 Delta Boulevard, Dept. 981
Atlanta, GA 30320
404.773.6520

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

3

1 INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS

2 EXAMINATION INDEX

3 BARBARA A. FRANZ

5 Examination by Ms. Brock	7
5 Examination by Mr. Tuyn	183
6 Re-Examination by Ms. Brock	184
7 Certificate Page	190

8 EXHIBIT INDEX

9 Plaintiff's Exhibit

10 1 Final Corrective Action Notice	52
11 Regarding Performance to Jason	
11 Conover dated 11-21-2012 (DEF-000174	
12 - DEF-000175)	
13 2 Corrective Action Notice Regarding	62
14 Performance to Christopher Culpepper	
14 dated 11-21-2012 (DEF-000166 -	
15 DEF-000167)	
16 3 Written Coaching Notice Regarding	68
17 Performance to Christopher Culpepper	
17 dated 11-21-2012 (DEF-164 - DEF-165)	
18 4 Delta policy excerpt (DEF-000093)	78
19 5 Confidential - Excerpt from the	82
20 Human Resources Practices Manual	
20 titled Personnel Conduct Standards	
21 and Appearance Guidelines dated	
21 8-25-2011 (DEF-000132 - DEF-000136)	
22 6 Confidential - Excerpt from the	90
23 Personnel Practices Manual titled	
23 Reliability dated 3-30-2005	
24 (DEF-000121 - DEF-000123)	
25 7 Confidential - Delta document	91
25 entitled Reliability (DEF-000124 -	
25 DEF-000129)	

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

4

1	8	Document titled Topics Discussed with Agent, Agent Jerrick Rodriques (DEF-000054)	93
2	9	Confidential - E-mail thread ending with e-mail from James C. Kriksciun to Mohammad Sarsour dated 12-11-2012 (DEF-000234 - DEF-000236)	95
3	10	Confidential - E-mail from Domingo DeLaTorre to Barbara Franz dated 12-17-2012 (DEF-000324)	98
4	11	Notice to File regarding Jerrick Rodriques dated 12-18-2012 (DEF-000057)	99
5	12	Internal Memorandum dated 12-18-2012 to Tyesha Gray from Barbara Franz (DEF-000041)	101
6	13	ACS/CGO Operation Checklist Recommendation for Termination of Employment (RFT) (DEF-000044)	104
7	14	Confidential - E-mail thread ending with e-mail from Barbara Franz to Nhia Francis dated 12-18-2012 (DEF-000210 - DEF-000211)	107
8	15	Confidential - E-mail thread ending with e-mail from Barbara Franz to Domingo DeLaTorre dated 12-18-2012 (DEF-000193)	109
9	16	Confidential - Memo to Mohammad Sarsour from Domingo De La Torre dated 12-15-2012 (DEF-000335)	111
10	17	Confidential - Memo to Mohammad Sarsour from Domingo De La Torre dated 12-15-2012 (DEF-000042)	112
11	18	Confidential - Support Document.pdf (DEF-000337)	113

25 (Continued on next page)

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

5

1 19 Confidential - E-mail from Barbara 121
2 Franz to Tyesha M. Gray dated
3 12-18-2012 (DEF-000176)
4 20 Confidential - E-mail from Barbara 123
5 Franz to Mohammad Sarsour dated
6 12-21-2012 (DEF-000181)
7 21 E-mail from Lisa Ali to Domingo De 123
8 La Torre and Mohammad Sarsour dated
9 1-9-2013 (DEF-000055)
10 22 Confidential - E-mail thread ending 125
11 with e-mail from Barbara Franz to
12 James Kriksciun dated 1-9-2013
13 (DEF-000231 - DEF-000232)
14
15 23 Confidential - E-mail thread ending 125
16 with e-mail from Barbara Franz to
17 Lisa Ali and others dated 1-10-2013
18 (DEF-000234 - DEF-000238)
19
20 24 Confidential - E-mail thread ending 126
21 with e-mail from Barbara Franz to
22 Kelley Nabors dated 4-5-2013
23 (DEF-000226 - DEF-000227)
24
25 25 Confidential - E-mail thread ending 128
26 with e-mail from Barbara Franz to
27 Kelley Nabors dated 4-8-2013
28 (DEF-000222 - DEF-000224)
29
30 26 Document regarding Employee: 138
31 Jerrick Rodrigues with the first
32 block dated 1-28-2013 (DEF-000058 -
33 DEF-000062)
34
35 27 Confidential - E-mail thread ending 152
36 with e-mail from Barbara Franz to
37 Cassandra LeeAustin dated 1-9-2013
38 (DEF-000196 - DEF-000197)
39
40 28 Confidential - Delta Air Lines Inc. 156
41 Ethics and Compliance Reporting
42 report number ending in 311 dated
43 1-3-2013 (DEF-000095 - DEF-000096)
44
45 (Continued on next page)

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

6

1	29	Confidential - ACS/CGO Compliance Call Report (DEF-000097 - DEF-000098)	164
2	30	Confidential - E-mail thread ending with e-mail from Sheandra R. Clark to Deborah Kircher dated 2-11-2013 (DEF-000368)	165
3	31	Confidential - Delta Air Lines Inc. Ethics and Compliance Reporting report number ending in 660 dated 1-3-2013 (DEF-000099 - DEF-000100)	175
4	32	Confidential - ACS/CGO Compliance Call Report (DEF-000101 - DEF-000102)	177
5	33	Confidential - Delta Air Lines Inc. Ethics and Compliance Reporting report number ending in 716 dated 1-8-2013 (DEF-000364 - DEF-000365)	178
6	34	Confidential - Delta Air Lines Inc. Ethics and Compliance Reporting report number ending in 159 dated 1-9-2013 (DEF-000103 - DEF-000104)	179
7	35	Confidential - ACS/CGO Compliance Call Report (DEF-000105 - DEF-000106)	179
8	36	Confidential - Delta Air Lines Inc. Ethics and Compliance Reporting report number ending in 421 dated 1-9-2013 (DEF-000107 - DEF-000108)	180
9	37	Confidential - ACS/CGO Compliance Call Report (DEF-000109 - DEF-000110)	181
10	38	Confidential - Delta Air Lines Inc. Ethics and Compliance Reporting report number ending in 995 dated 1-31-2013 (DEF-000111 - DEF-000112)	182
11	39	Confidential - ACS/CGO Compliance Report (DEF-000113)	182
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

7 (Pages 7 to 10)

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

8 (Pages 11 to 14)

<p>1 So if you don't understand it, let 2 me know. I will not take offense. But if you 3 answer it, I'm going to presume you understood 4 what I was asking you. Okay?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And what high school did you 7 graduate from in '97?</p> <p>8 A Howell High School.</p> <p>9 Q Is that in Michigan?</p> <p>10 A Yes, it is.</p> <p>11 Q Did you pursue any post-high school 12 education?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Where did you attend?</p> <p>15 A Grand Valley State.</p> <p>16 Q My daughter's at Saginaw Valley, so 17 she wouldn't be happy to hear that.</p> <p>18 A As well as Eastern Michigan 19 University.</p> <p>20 Q What years did you attend Grand 21 Valley?</p> <p>22 A '97 to 2001.</p> <p>23 Q And what area of study were you 24 pursuing?</p> <p>25 A It was a bachelor in business with</p>	<p>11</p> <p>1 Q And that was through SHRM?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 (Whereupon Mr. Langel enters the 4 deposition.)</p> <p>5 Q For the record, SHRM, acronym. So 6 you had your PHR. Did you ever go for your 7 SPHR?</p> <p>8 A I did not.</p> <p>9 Q And at this point, you have not 10 maintained your PHR certification?</p> <p>11 A Unfortunately, it expired.</p> <p>12 Q I'm sure mine has as well. Did you 13 take any special training courses in 14 preparation for your PHR, or did you 15 self-study?</p> <p>16 A I did take a three-day training 17 through SHRM in Chicago.</p> <p>18 Q How long ago was that?</p> <p>19 A That would have been -- it's been a 20 while. I would -- I would -- I don't want to 21 guess. It's probably been at least five 22 years. It's been quite some time.</p> <p>23 Q Did that three-day training through 24 SHRM in Chicago contain training in how to 25 conduct investigations?</p>
<p>12</p> <p>1 emphasis in HR.</p> <p>2 Q Did you graduate from Grand Valley?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Back during that '97-to-2001 time 5 frame, did your course of study in human 6 resources at Grand Valley include how to 7 conduct investigations?</p> <p>8 A Oh, I don't recall.</p> <p>9 Q And then at some later point, you 10 attended Eastern Michigan?</p> <p>11 A That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q What years were you at Eastern?</p> <p>13 A 2001 to 2003, I believe. It might 14 be 2004.</p> <p>15 Q And what program were you in?</p> <p>16 A I received an MBA from Eastern.</p> <p>17 Q And what year did you graduate?</p> <p>18 A Either 2003 or 2004.</p> <p>19 Q Was your MBA degree focused in any 20 way on human resource management?</p> <p>21 A It was not. It was a general 22 business degree.</p> <p>23 Q Are you a certified human resource 24 professional?</p> <p>25 A Used to be.</p>	<p>14</p> <p>1 A I don't believe so. It was more 2 law-focused --</p> <p>3 Q That's what I thought.</p> <p>4 A -- process, yeah.</p> <p>5 Q I just wanted to ask. Outside of 6 the training that you received for your PHR 7 certification, have you had any other 8 specialized human resource training?</p> <p>9 A When you say "specialized," can you 10 elaborate on what you mean by that?</p> <p>11 Q Sure. Just training in HR, in 12 HR-related subjects?</p> <p>13 A So I would receive that here at 14 Delta, yes.</p> <p>15 Q Let's talk about the training that 16 you've received here at Delta. First of all, 17 when did you begin working for Delta?</p> <p>18 A Well, to be honest, I was actually 19 Northwest, so kind of a tricky question. So I 20 began in April of 2005. The merger took place 21 in 2009. So technically, that's when I became 22 Delta, if you will.</p> <p>23 Q So let's talk about from the merger 24 forward --</p> <p>25 A Okay.</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

9 (Pages 15 to 18)

<p>1 Q -- as far as your training. Can you 2 tell me about the human resource training 3 you've received from 2009 forward? 4 A So when I became Delta, we had an HR 5 training. It was a two-day training to learn 6 about how Delta handles HR issues. That would 7 have included everything from the policy manual 8 to leaves of absence to benefits, open 9 enrollment, conducting investigations, 10 basically a big-picture overview of everything 11 that we do from an HR perspective. 12 Following that, we have updated our 13 training, if you will, since then. And I have 14 received formal, specifically, investigation 15 training, and that's facilitated by our law 16 department as well as our equal opportunity 17 department. 18 Q When did you receive that specific 19 investigation training? 20 A I would say it was around about say 21 March of 2010. That would have been when we 22 merged our performance development process 23 between Northwest and Delta. 24 Q Has that investigation training been 25 repeated for you since March of 2010?</p>	<p>15</p> <p>1 train the leaders to that level. They get a 2 much higher level view of that. 3 Q So is it safe to say the training 4 that you would get as an HR professional is 5 more in-depth than the training that the 6 leaders are given on how to conduct those 7 investigations? 8 A Not in how to conduct it. 9 Q Not the process? 10 A Correct. 11 Q But more in-depth as to the next 12 levels of the investigation? 13 A I wouldn't even say next levels. I 14 would just say who would review it and/or who 15 would be involved. But they're aware of that. 16 It's just our -- we're the ones who have the 17 contact information. 18 MS. BROCK: We had an extra person 19 join us. Who do we have? 20 MS. GIUSTINA: This is Ryan Langel. 21 He's been in our law department for, what, 22 about two years? 23 MR. LANGEL: Two years. 24 MS. GIUSTINA: And he's sort of a 25 brand new lawyer, and so he doesn't get to see</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>17</p>
		<p>16</p>	<p>18</p>

1 A I would be present during that being
2 facilitated to leaders, but I haven't been a
3 participant again.
4 Q Were you a teacher or presenter?
5 A Not of that section, no.
6 Q And how often have you been present
7 for the presentation of how to conduct
8 investigations for the leaders?
9 A I would say -- let's see. We do it
10 on a quarterly basis, and I probably attend
11 once a year since 2010.
12 Q Was the way that you were trained in
13 your individualized or specialized
14 investigation training different from how the
15 leaders are being trained on how to conduct
16 these investigations?
17 A The process, no.
18 Q What about them is different?
19 Because you sound as if something is different,
20 but it's not the process. What is different?
21 A The resources available and when to
22 bring others in the investigation. So for
23 example, if it is theft related, to involve
24 corporate security. So we're trained as HR
25 professionals of that. We don't necessarily

1 this often, and I invited him. I hope that's
2 okay with everybody.
3 MS. BROCK: It is okay. I just was
4 curious. There's other attorneys that do this
5 way better than I do, so do not put this in
6 your book of how to take depositions.
7 MR. LANGEL: Well, you're doing fine
8 by my book, so.
9 Q Let's talk about the process for
10 conducting the investigation. Now, is the
11 process for conducting an investigation the
12 same for a situation that would occur for theft
13 as it would be for a discrimination complaint?
14 A Yes.
15 Q Tell me the process for conducting
16 these investigations.
17 A So the process would be first to
18 speak to the person who has the complaint or
19 the concern and get as much detail as possible.
20 We do ask employees to write a written
21 statement typically.
22 Following that, we're going to look
23 to see if there's any evidence to collect
24 related to the incident, whether it's, you
25 know, computer records or what -- oh, gosh,

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

10 (Pages 19 to 22)

<p>1 whatever else we have that we can obtain. 2 Following that, we would interview 3 any witnesses related to the incident. And 4 then we would look to see what potential policy 5 is potentially violated. 6 Once we have collected all that 7 information, we would make a decision based 8 upon what we could substantiate throughout the 9 investigation and take the appropriate action. 10 Q So you would speak to the 11 complainant typically to get additional detail, 12 perhaps get a written statement from that 13 individual, and then you would determine 14 whether there was any evidence to be collected. 15 And in particular, you mentioned like from the 16 computer system and the like. 17 And then any witnesses that may have 18 been present, you would conduct interviews of 19 those witnesses. Then you would determine 20 whether there was a policy violated. And then 21 you would determine what could be substantiated 22 and what couldn't be. And then you would 23 determine what action is taken. Did I get that 24 correct? 25 A You did.</p>	<p>19</p> <p>1 Q Since becoming a senior HR manager, 2 have you been located here in Georgia? 3 A That's correct. 4 Q And over what period of time were 5 you an HR manager? 6 A Since April of 2005. The title 7 changed a few times, but the role was the same. 8 Q So from April 2005 through about 9 September of 2014? 10 A Correct. 11 MR. TUYN: And I assume your 12 question's taken into account her prior 13 testimony that she was Northwest in 2005. 14 MS. BROCK: Well, yeah, because I'm 15 getting ready to -- 16 MR. TUYN: So you're not limiting it 17 to Delta? 18 MS. BROCK: No, because I'm getting 19 ready to probe a little bit to break that up, 20 and I know the title changed when the merger 21 happened. 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23 MS. BROCK: So I was going to get 24 that on the record. 25 Q And so as an HR manager, were you</p> <p>21</p>
<p>1 Q As to the interviewing of witnesses, 2 are there instances where interviewing a 3 witness is not necessary? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Can you explain to me what 6 circumstances would lead you to believe that 7 interviewing a witness is not necessary? 8 A If the person who brings forth the 9 complaint and the person who is alleged to have 10 violated the policy, if their recollections are 11 exactly the same, we would not go forth and 12 interview witnesses. We would bring in the 13 witnesses only if there was discrepancy between 14 those two employees. 15 Q Let's talk about your employment 16 history a little bit. What is your current 17 position? 18 A I'm a senior human resource 19 manager. 20 Q And how long have you been employed 21 with Delta as a senior HR manager? 22 A Since September of 2014. 23 Q And what position did you hold prior 24 to September of 2014? 25 A Human resource manager.</p>	<p>20</p> <p>22</p> <p>1 located in Detroit during that time? 2 A Yes. 3 Q As counsel mentioned, you are one of 4 the individuals that have affectionately come 5 to be known as a Northwest person. So you 6 would have been a Northwest employee prior to 7 becoming a Delta employee; correct? 8 A That's correct. 9 Q What was your title prior to the 10 merger? 11 A It was a human resource generalist. 12 Q And when did your employment with 13 Northwest begin? 14 A April of 2005. 15 Q So when you were hired in at 16 Northwest, you were hired in as an HR 17 generalist? 18 A That's correct. 19 Q And you remained an HR generalist 20 until after the merger or somewhere around the 21 merger? 22 A Thereafter. The HR manager title is 23 relatively new. It's not really merger 24 related. 25 Q So you remained an HR generalist</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

11 (Pages 23 to 26)

<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 after the merger. And then at some later 2 point, the title became HR manager?</p> <p>3 A Correct.</p> <p>4 Q Do you recall when the title changed 5 to HR manager?</p> <p>6 A I believe it was 2013. It's fairly 7 recent.</p> <p>8 Q If you could tell me, what were the 9 job duties that you performed when you were an 10 HR generalist/HR manager in Detroit?</p> <p>11 A So I would have had oversight of 12 everything HR related for the airport customer 13 service employees in Detroit. That would have 14 included all of the customer service agents as 15 well as all of the ramp employees in Detroit.</p> <p>16 Q The below-the-wing people?</p> <p>17 A Correct.</p> <p>18 MR. TUYN: Ms. Brock, I know you're 19 asking the question HR generalist/HR manager. 20 But as we've heard from other witnesses, 21 there's a distinction between Northwest and 22 Delta in that Northwest was union represented 23 and Delta is not, so.</p> <p>24 MS. BROCK: Right.</p> <p>25 MR. TUYN: I assume the duties are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 left coming to Detroit. So let's take the time 2 to do that.</p> <p>3 Q So your job duties, prior to the 4 merger was there a difference in your job 5 duties?</p> <p>6 A So the -- when I said the job duties 7 were similar, my intention was that HR -- you 8 know, I was HR in both companies. You know, 9 the benefits, the investigations, those duties 10 were similar, if not the same. But the way we 11 go about achieving those duties are different 12 at the two organizations. So I think that's a 13 good clarification.</p> <p>14 Q So let me just start with what those 15 duties were, and then we can back up and talk 16 about the differences and how you accomplished 17 those duties. So let's just talk about the 18 duties. You began with oversight of everything 19 for the below-the-wing staff?</p> <p>20 A As well as the above-wing, the 21 customer service agents.</p> <p>22 Q Oh, above-the-wing as well?</p> <p>23 A Yes, correct.</p> <p>24 Q And so you would have been 25 responsible for overseeing all of the HR</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>1 different. So if you're asking for duties --</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>3 MR. TUYN: -- I think you're going 4 to have to differentiate between Northwest and 5 Delta.</p> <p>6 MS. BROCK: Well, initially she 7 testified that the duties stayed the same, 8 which is why I grouped them together. So if 9 the duties changed, we do need to separate it 10 off, but her testimony was that the duties 11 stayed the same.</p> <p>12 And that the title changed, but the 13 title changed well after it became Delta. So 14 it had nothing to do with the union going away. 15 It had nothing to do with the merger. It 16 wasn't until 2013 that the title actually 17 changed to HR manager.</p> <p>18 MR. TUYN: Yeah. I don't think she 19 testified that all the duties stayed the same.</p> <p>20 MS. BROCK: Well, she didn't say the 21 word all. But I asked her did the duties stay 22 the same, and she said yeah. So I have no 23 problem breaking it up because I absolutely 24 want to know the differences between what she 25 did from the time she got there to the time she</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">26</p> <p>1 responsibilities from hiring to benefits to 2 training to discipline and termination?</p> <p>3 A Correct. And the involvement and 4 the process would be different.</p> <p>5 Q Can you tell me when it was 6 Northwest, what was the involvement in the 7 process?</p> <p>8 A So the involvement with the hiring, 9 we actually did all of the hiring in-house, so 10 the involvement was much greater. The benefits 11 administration was all in-house. Payroll was 12 all in-house. So those questions were more -- 13 we had a union at Northwest.</p> <p>14 So the investigation and discipline 15 process would have been different in that, you 16 know, a union representative would have been 17 present as we were conducting investigations. 18 There was the grievance process. Let me think 19 what else would be different.</p> <p>20 Q In the Northwest days, there was an 21 incident that occurred out at what is now the 22 Delta cargo out on Merriman where some nooses 23 were hung. Would you have been privy to that 24 as the HR representative at that time?</p> <p>25 A Not as Northwest. I didn't have</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

12 (Pages 27 to 30)

27	29
<p>1 cargo until it became Delta. That would have 2 been a different HR person.</p> <p>3 Q And so you never heard about the 4 noose-hanging incident at the cargo?</p> <p>5 A I'm not aware of that, no.</p> <p>6 Q So the people that were out at the 7 cargo, did those people eventually come over to 8 what I'm going to call metro, I may not have 9 the terminology for Delta/Northwest correct, 10 but did those individuals come over to metro?</p> <p>11 A When you say, "did they come 12 over" --</p> <p>13 Q Yeah.</p> <p>14 A -- do you mean --</p> <p>15 Q Did they begin to work over at the 16 metro location?</p> <p>17 A The employees can bid to come to and 18 from the cargo facility to the airport, but we 19 didn't pick up all of the cargo employees and 20 bring them to the airport, if that's what 21 you're asking.</p> <p>22 Q So if anyone from the Northwest 23 cargo era chose to bid, they could very well 24 now be working over at metro?</p> <p>25 A They could be, yes.</p>	<p>1 give you any indication individually. But did 2 they give you any indication generally that 3 there had been some racial tension or any sort 4 of racial incident at the cargo and that these 5 employees are also working and bidding and 6 coming over to metro?</p> <p>7 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>8 Q Now, I somewhat interrupted you. 9 You were telling me about the differences in 10 the process pre-merger and post-merger, and you 11 had gotten through pre-merger. And we had 12 talked about basically it appears that prior to 13 you becoming a Delta employee, more of the 14 human resource responsibilities were done 15 in-house, that you-all were more responsible 16 locally for taking care of human resource 17 issues. Am I correct in that?</p> <p>18 A Related to benefits and payroll, 19 yes, and recruiting.</p> <p>20 Q What kinds of things still were 21 taken care of outside of your local HR? 22 Because you made a distinction, and I don't 23 know where the distinction is. You pointed to 24 benefits, you pointed to payroll, and you 25 pointed to union activity as being something</p>
28	30
<p>1 Q And you say you weren't responsible 2 for Northwest cargo. Who was responsible for 3 Northwest, HR-wise, cargo?</p> <p>4 A It would have been a different HR 5 person. I don't know who that would have been 6 at the time. We move a lot in HR, so I don't 7 recall.</p> <p>8 Q Did Northwest ever make you as an HR 9 person aware that there had been an incident at 10 the cargo and that employees that were at the 11 cargo were now coming over to metro?</p> <p>12 A So can you repeat that question for 13 me?</p> <p>14 Q Yeah. I guess where I'm trying to 15 go with it is whether you were ever alerted 16 that you had employees that may have been 17 involved in some sort of racial issue at cargo 18 that are now coming over and working at metro.</p> <p>19 A So I would not have received an 20 alert of that, no. Was I aware that folks went 21 from cargo to the airport? Yes. Would I have 22 received an e-mail or a phone call saying 23 Johnny's coming over tomorrow and, oh, by the 24 way, here's his history? No.</p> <p>25 Q And I understand that they didn't</p>	<p>1 that was handled in-house. 2 And I took it a step further and 3 said locally those things were handled. And 4 you kind of led me to believe or by your 5 response that there were some things that were 6 HR related that were not handled locally when 7 you were Northwest. Am I correct in that?</p> <p>8 A No. I mean, I would say parts of 9 the grievance process would not be handled 10 locally depending on the level that it would go 11 to. But, you know, I didn't administer the 12 benefit plan. That happens corporately. I 13 mean, each location didn't have a separate pay 14 scale or a separate benefit plan.</p> <p>15 So the administration of those plans 16 would have been handled corporately, but the 17 questions from employees would have been 18 handled locally.</p> <p>19 Q So is my understanding correct that 20 the HR, the local HR, was responsible for 21 carrying out the rules, policies, and 22 procedures of the corporation?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And that local HR was responsible 25 for the purview -- their reach would have been</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

13 (Pages 31 to 34)

<p>31</p> <p>1 Detroit metro?</p> <p>2 A Well, my reach would have been the 3 above and below-wing employees, not all of 4 metro. We also have pilots and flight 5 attendants, and those would have had -- as well 6 as, you mentioned cargo. Those would have had 7 separate HR folks.</p> <p>8 So my reach, yes, would have been 9 all of that within what we call airport 10 customer service which is the above and 11 below-wing employees.</p> <p>12 Q Now, you also indicated that after 13 the merger there were some changes to the 14 process by which you conducted pretty much 15 those same responsibilities. Can you tell me 16 about those differences in the process?</p> <p>17 A Yes. So to be clear, all those 18 changes would not have happened right at merger 19 because there had to have been, you know, a 20 union election and things happened, you know, 21 in a pretty orderly fashion. So I'll talk to 22 the changes, but the changes happened at 23 different points.</p> <p>24 Q They were gradual?</p> <p>25 A Correct. So the benefits, the</p>	<p>33</p> <p>1 position that would require you to relocate?</p> <p>2 A Well, it was the position that -- 3 you know, increased responsibility. It's a 4 promotion. There's lots more opportunity at 5 Delta here in Atlanta as well.</p> <p>6 Q In your role as a human resource 7 generalist/manager for Delta, what involvement, 8 if any, did you have in disciplining employees?</p> <p>9 A I did not administer discipline.</p> <p>10 Q Right. But my question is: What 11 role did you play in disciplining of employees? 12 What involvement did you have?</p> <p>13 A Well, it would depend upon the 14 circumstances. Some instances, I would have no 15 involvement. The leader would do -- would do 16 it on their own. Other circumstances, I may 17 have just seen the investigation results and 18 here's what the recommendation from the leader 19 is and I say I support.</p> <p>20 Other instances, I may actually 21 conduct the investigation with the leader and 22 provide my recommendations to leadership of 23 what to happen. So it really varies based on 24 the circumstances.</p> <p>25 Q Now, you indicated that sometimes</p>
<p>32</p> <p>1 payroll, retirement, those type of questions, 2 we actually have at Delta an employee service 3 center. So employees can call the service 4 center to get those questions answered. 5 Although I do answer those questions locally, 6 many employees call that number to get those 7 types of questions answered.</p> <p>8 The focus at Delta is more 9 employee-relations focused as well as 10 leadership-development focused versus kind of 11 the what we would consider traditional HR work, 12 the benefits, the payroll, all of that type of 13 thing. As well as the grievance process would 14 have went away once union -- the representation 15 vote took place.</p> <p>16 Q Why did you move to Georgia?</p> <p>17 A This is a new position. It's a 18 promotion for me.</p> <p>19 Q Is this a position you had to apply 20 for?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Was there some sort of internal 23 posting at Delta for the position?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q What made you decide to apply for a</p>	<p>34</p> <p>1 you have no role at all. So is it the case 2 that when you were in Detroit as a Delta 3 employee that disciplines would take place and 4 you wouldn't have any idea that the discipline 5 took place?</p> <p>6 A That's correct.</p> <p>7 Q And is there a particular level by 8 which they needed to notify you of a discipline 9 taking place?</p> <p>10 A Not a particular level, no. It was 11 more based on the topic.</p> <p>12 Q What kinds of topics did they need 13 to notify you that a discipline had taken 14 place?</p> <p>15 A Typically, it would be circumstances 16 where it involved a people policy versus an 17 operational policy.</p> <p>18 Q Explain to me, what do you mean by a 19 "people policy"?</p> <p>20 A So a violation of any of the 21 corporate HR policies, such as discrimination 22 or time and attendance or any of the people 23 policies versus they didn't follow the 24 appropriate procedure when working the aircraft.</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

14 (Pages 35 to 38)

<p>1 Q So, for example, if an employee is 2 driving one of those little carts and they 3 don't have their seat belt on and they get a 4 safety infraction, they wouldn't necessarily 5 have to notify you of that?</p> <p>6 A Correct. They know what to do. 7 They handle that.</p> <p>8 Q Would they have to notify you for 9 any sort of time card fraud discipline?</p> <p>10 A Well, let me be clear. They don't 11 have to necessarily notify me. When I say 12 "have to," it's not -- I don't know how to 13 describe it.</p> <p>14 Q I don't either. So please try. 15 Please try.</p> <p>16 A The role of HR at Delta is to advise 17 and counsel based on the policies. The leader 18 makes that decision. We help them make the 19 right decision for the company. So are there 20 instances where there was potentially time card 21 issues where they didn't bring it to my 22 attention? That's very possible.</p> <p>23 However, the team in Detroit was 24 really good about making me aware of those 25 circumstances. Can I say absolutely every time</p>	<p>35</p> <p>1 end? Let me try to fix the question. 2 So I asked you a question about the 3 back end. The discipline has already been 4 done, you've become aware of it, and what could 5 you do about it. And basically, it's nothing 6 except go to the higher management and say, 7 hey, I think you have a problem here, this 8 shouldn't have happened this way, and something 9 different needs to happen. Am I correct in 10 that?</p> <p>11 A The influence of that.</p> <p>12 Q The influence of that --</p> <p>13 A Yes, correct.</p> <p>14 Q -- on the back end. On the front 15 end prior to the discipline actually being 16 administered, do you have any authority to say 17 what level of discipline should be administered 18 on that front end?</p> <p>19 A I make recommendations, yes.</p> <p>20 Q Do they have to follow your 21 recommendations?</p> <p>22 A No. But to clarify, if -- again, if 23 we disagree, we're going to their leader. It's 24 a very fluid process. I know it sounds kind 25 of -- I don't know. I don't know how it</p>
<p>1 they made me aware? I can't say that.</p> <p>2 Q And if you needed to investigate a 3 decision that was made that maybe you weren't 4 made aware of, you could just ask the manager 5 what happened, why did you take this particular 6 course of action?</p> <p>7 A Correct.</p> <p>8 Q One of the things that you said is 9 that HR advises and counsels and basically 10 they're there to help the management to make 11 the right decision. So if at some later point 12 it came to your attention that the management 13 didn't make the right decision, do you have the 14 authority to cause any change to happen?</p> <p>15 A Me personally, no. I would have to 16 go to their leader to say, I don't believe they 17 made the right decision, here's why. And then 18 their leader would be the one to ultimately 19 make the decision to change that decision.</p> <p>20 Q So is it also true that as an HR 21 employee manager/generalist in Detroit that you 22 couldn't necessarily -- you didn't have the 23 authority to necessarily change whatever 24 decision had been made. Did you also have the 25 authority to say what would happen on the front</p>	<p>36</p> <p>1 sounds. But if we're talking and we have an 2 issue and I say it should be this and you're 3 the leader and you say it should be this level 4 and we disagree, we're going to your leader. 5 And then the leader is going to 6 weigh in. And if necessary, we're going to go 7 to their leader. And if not there, we're going 8 to go to my leader until we can all agree on 9 what the appropriate action is.</p> <p>10 Q I think I understand a little bit. 11 And be patient with me on this.</p> <p>12 A No problem.</p> <p>13 Q Because I worked in human resources 14 a lot of years. And then I've been practicing 15 as an attorney in labor and employment for a 16 number of years. And I've never come across a 17 corporation that's set up quite this way.</p> <p>18 A Okay.</p> <p>19 Q So you're really teaching me 20 something very new to add to my list of things 21 to just know. So when you say it's very fluid, 22 would this process continue until there's some 23 agreement between HR and the, I want to call it 24 the operations side?</p> <p>25 A Yes. And, you know, if at some</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

15 (Pages 39 to 42)

<p>1 point, you know, I think there's enough risk, I 2 may involve our legal department. Or I may 3 involve or equal opportunity department to say, 4 you know, can you provide the operations some 5 comparables on why what they're trying to do is 6 not with our practice?</p> <p>7 It's rare that it gets to that 8 point. I'd like to think I'm good at what I do 9 and can influence the decision, but there is a 10 process in place to do that.</p> <p>11 Q But you're unable to utilize those 12 skills if the management on the operations side 13 didn't make you aware that a particular 14 situation was going on; correct?</p> <p>15 A That would be correct. However, as 16 you mentioned, I may find out about it on the 17 back end and influence a different decision. 18 And they don't like that. They don't want to 19 have to go back and make a different decision. 20 So they are very good, and it is the culture 21 that HR is involved in that, in those 22 processes.</p> <p>23 I'm sorry if I gave you the 24 impression that they're just out there doing 25 whatever they want because that's not the case.</p>	<p>39</p> <p>1 clarify my understanding because I've gotten my 2 understanding from lots of different people and 3 none of them are fully the HR person that you 4 are. And so that's why I wanted to talk to you 5 so badly, because I thought that you could help 6 me to clarify what is still unclear for me in 7 my head.</p> <p>8 So the PL has the authority to make 9 a decision about whether to discipline an 10 employee or not. Am I correct in that?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Once the PL makes that decision, do 13 they run that decision up to their leader?</p> <p>14 A Almost always.</p> <p>15 Q Can they make the decision without 16 running it up to their leader?</p> <p>17 A Can they?</p> <p>18 Q Yes.</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q In particular, if a PL decides not 21 to discipline an employee, there would be no 22 way for that direct manager to necessarily know 23 that the PL made that decision. Am I correct 24 in that? So something happens. I see you do 25 something. And I'm not going to discipline you</p>
<p>40</p> <p>1 You know, is there a seat belt violation that I 2 wasn't aware of? Sure. But anytime it's, you 3 know, we're taking statements and it's an 4 investigation, they're very good about reaching 5 out to the HR person and saying here's what we 6 have, what's the appropriate level of 7 performance development.</p> <p>8 I just don't want to give you the 9 impression that absolutely everything comes 10 across my desk because that wouldn't be 11 accurate either.</p> <p>12 MR. TUYN: Barb, Felicia's very good 13 at asking questions. You have to be careful to 14 just answer her questions.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>16 MR. TUYN: You're going well beyond 17 her questions.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>19 MR. TUYN: If she wants to go into 20 that, she can.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>22 MR. TUYN: You've got to listen to 23 her question and answer her question.</p> <p>24 Q I was going to kind of come back 25 anyways, so thank you. Because let me just</p>	<p>40</p> <p>1 for whatever the reason. 2 The department manager would not 3 necessarily be aware of that; correct?</p> <p>4 A Correct.</p> <p>5 Q Now, if the PL makes the decision to 6 put something in writing, would that then cause 7 the DM to be aware that some discipline took 8 place?</p> <p>9 A Most of the time, yes.</p> <p>10 Q Explain to me the "most of the 11 time." Under what circumstances or what are 12 you thinking about that causes you to say, 13 indefinitely, yeah, if they put it in writing 14 that they're going to run it up to the DM or 15 the DM would be aware?</p> <p>16 A The DM typically reviews the 17 letter. The DM is sometimes present when the 18 letter is issued. But to say that that happens 19 a hundred percent of the time, I can't say 20 that.</p> <p>21 Q And then under what circumstances 22 does the DM, if you know, because I don't even 23 know if this changes based on DM, does the DM 24 take that discipline decision to the general 25 manager?</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

16 (Pages 43 to 46)

<p>43</p> <p>1 A I don't know when -- I mean, can you 2 repeat the question for me?</p> <p>3 Q Yeah. Because I've gotten -- I've 4 taken you from PL --</p> <p>5 A Yeah.</p> <p>6 Q -- and what the PL's authority is. 7 And we've talked about the authority to decide 8 not to discipline and that really no one would 9 know that they decided -- necessarily know that 10 they decided not to discipline.</p> <p>11 We've talked about the PL deciding 12 to discipline and that the letter being 13 presented to the DM, but you can't say a 14 hundred percent of the time, but typically 15 being presented to the DM.</p> <p>16 Now, I'm at the DM level, and I'm 17 saying from the DM to the GM. Would that 18 letter then go from the DM to the GM?</p> <p>19 A At certain levels, yes.</p> <p>20 Q What levels would the discipline 21 then go from the DM to the GM, if you know?</p> <p>22 A The final corrective action for 23 sure.</p> <p>24 Q And the GM for the below-the-wing 25 folks, I think I'm jazzy now, would that have</p>	<p>45</p> <p>1 Q Summary from the leader, that would 2 be the PL?</p> <p>3 A Or the department manager.</p> <p>4 Q And so do you remember anything else 5 being a part of this investigation that you 6 reviewed for Conover and Culpepper?</p> <p>7 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>8 Q Were the -- I'm going to help you a 9 little bit.</p> <p>10 A Okay.</p> <p>11 Q Were the Kronos punches a part of 12 that investigatory packet?</p> <p>13 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>14 Q Were the County swipes a part of 15 that investigatory package?</p> <p>16 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>17 Q Did you pull any information outside 18 of what was provided to you on Mr. Conover or 19 Mr. Culpepper?</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 Q The investigatory information that 22 you reviewed on Mr. Conover and Mr. Culpepper, 23 where does that information go? And by that I 24 mean, if someone is under investigation leading 25 to discipline, are the investigatory documents</p>
<p>44</p> <p>1 been Mohammad Sarsour during the 2012 time 2 period?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Now, I think Mr. De La Torre, he 5 testified that he takes all of his disciplinary 6 decisions up to the general manager. Is that 7 your experience with Mr. De La Torre?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q When in the process of the 10 discipline moving from the PL to the DM to the 11 GM is HR involved, or is it at various stages?</p> <p>12 A Various stages.</p> <p>13 Q Were you involved at all in the 14 disciplines of Jason Conover or Christopher 15 Culpepper?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q How were you involved?</p> <p>18 A I reviewed the investigation and 19 their recommendation for discipline.</p> <p>20 Q What did the investigation that you 21 reviewed consist of?</p> <p>22 A Statements from both Conover and 23 Culpepper as well as summary from I believe -- 24 I don't recall who the leader was who ran that 25 investigation.</p>	<p>46</p> <p>1 put in their personnel record? Are they kept 2 in the file cabinet marked investigations? I 3 mean, what happens to those documents?</p> <p>4 A The actual investigation documents?</p> <p>5 Q Yeah.</p> <p>6 A Is that what you're asking?</p> <p>7 Q Yeah.</p> <p>8 A They would be kept in an 9 investigation file.</p> <p>10 Q And where is that file kept?</p> <p>11 A That particular one would likely be 12 in my office.</p> <p>13 Q Now, after you left, what happened 14 to the files that were in your office?</p> <p>15 A They're still there.</p> <p>16 Q Okay.</p> <p>17 A I don't know. You would have to ask 18 the person who's there now.</p> <p>19 Q Who took your place down there? Do 20 you know?</p> <p>21 A Who replaced me?</p> <p>22 Q Yeah.</p> <p>23 A Danielle Hughes.</p> <p>24 Q Is she in your office now?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

17 (Pages 47 to 50)

<p>1 MS. BROCK: Just for the record, 2 Attorney Tuyn, and I know you're aware of this, 3 I didn't receive a written statement for 4 Mr. Conover. And I also did not receive a 5 summary from the PL or department manager as to 6 the Conover-Culpepper incident.</p> <p>7 Q If you could tell me, at least for 8 the summary, I think I have -- I have 9 Mr. Culpepper's statement, so I know what he 10 said. I have Mr. Conover's testimony of what 11 he said in his written statement, so I think 12 I'm good there.</p> <p>13 I don't have that summary. Can you 14 tell me, what do you recall being in the 15 summary from the PL or department manager? And 16 I understand you don't remember which. But can 17 you tell me what was in that summary? What do 18 you remember?</p> <p>19 A I don't recall what was in the 20 summary.</p> <p>21 Q Let me ask this. And if you know 22 it, then maybe it came from the summary. And 23 we can try to figure out, if it didn't, when 24 you found it out. Were you made aware that 25 Mr. Culpepper -- well, let me back up.</p>	<p>1 discipline, so that's not a fair question. 2 When I say "time card fraud," I mean that he 3 was accused of being punched in and not working 4 for part of his shift.</p> <p>5 A Yesterday.</p> <p>6 Q When did you, and I know it's a 7 similar question, slightly different, when did 8 you find out that Mr. Culpepper's pay was 9 docked for four hours for being punched in and 10 not working part of his shift in that November 11 2012 time frame?</p> <p>12 A Per you just saying it. I was not 13 aware of that.</p> <p>14 Q Let's talk about Mr. Conover just a 15 little bit. Now, I do know that you're aware, 16 and we're going to get to how I know and all 17 the documents in just a minute, I do know that 18 you were aware that Mr. Conover asked 19 Mr. Culpepper to remove him from the RTS line; 20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Were you aware that Mr. Conover went 23 and found a place to sleep and would sleep 24 throughout the vast majority of his shift that 25 day?</p>
<p>1 You are aware or you were aware that 2 Mr. Culpepper removed Mr. Conover from the RTS 3 line; correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And that he was not the ALA, the RTS 6 ALA, and he should not have been removing 7 anyone from the line; correct?</p> <p>8 A Correct.</p> <p>9 Q Were you aware at the time of this 10 discipline, that would have been back in 11 November of 2012 -- it's hard to forget things, 12 I'm asking you to forget it if you found it out 13 later -- were you aware that Mr. Culpepper also 14 was being disciplined because he was punched in 15 and was not working for part of the shift?</p> <p>16 A At that point, no.</p> <p>17 Q Were you made aware at that point 18 that Mr. Culpepper was actually docked four 19 hours of pay for being punched in and not 20 working part of the shift?</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q When did you become aware that 23 Mr. Culpepper was also being disciplined for 24 time card fraud? And when I say "time card 25 fraud," because I know it says that in the</p>	<p>1 48 50</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Were you aware that Mr. Conover's 3 pay was docked pretty much the entire shift for 4 his being punched in and being somewhere else 5 asleep --</p> <p>6 A No.</p> <p>7 Q -- on the job that day?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q Now, I understand you weren't aware 10 of that in the 2012 time frame. Were you aware 11 of his pay being docked for his being punched 12 in and not working the vast majority of his 13 shift back in November of 2012 prior to today?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q You just found that out when I said 16 it?</p> <p>17 A That's correct.</p> <p>18 Q Were you made aware in the January 19 of 2014 time frame that Mr. Culpepper's 20 discipline was reduced from a written 21 corrective to a written coaching?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q Have you ever in your time as a 24 Delta employee, which would -- bad question. 25 During your time as an HR</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

18 (Pages 51 to 54)

<p>51</p> <p>1 generalist/manager, which means you would have 2 been in Detroit, Delta employee, were you aware 3 of an employee being disciplined and then that 4 discipline being later reduced to a lower 5 discipline?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Under what circumstances?</p> <p>8 A I can't give you a specific 9 circumstance.</p> <p>10 Q Well, can you tell me what 11 circumstances, not referencing anyone in 12 particular -- your testimony is that you know 13 it's happened; correct?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q Can you tell me what circumstances 16 would lead to an employee's discipline being 17 reduced?</p> <p>18 A The ones that I recall were -- I 19 can't recall the specific infraction, but it 20 would have been an employee who came to myself 21 or the next level of leadership and said, I 22 think this is inappropriate. And after review, 23 it was determined that, yes, it was 24 inappropriate, and a different letter or in 25 some cases the -- no letter, you know, the</p>	<p>53</p> <p>1 Mr. Conover was being investigated for time 2 card fraud. Was what Mr. Conover was accused 3 of doing considered time card fraud?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q Why not?</p> <p>6 A From what I recall, he was given 7 authorization to be off the clock or to be away 8 from his work area.</p> <p>9 Q So your recollection is that 10 Mr. Conover was given permission to be away 11 from his work area. To your knowledge, did 12 that permission extend to remaining punched in 13 and sleeping for the vast majority of his 14 shift?</p> <p>15 A No.</p> <p>16 Q And so would his being punched in 17 and being somewhere else sleeping for the vast 18 majority of his shift be considered time card 19 fraud?</p> <p>20 A I would not have considered it that.</p> <p>21 Q And why not?</p> <p>22 A Because he was given authorization 23 to do so.</p> <p>24 Q You're saying that it's your 25 understanding that Mr. Culpepper gave him this</p>
<p>52</p> <p>1 letter was just removed, took place.</p> <p>2 Q Thank you for that, because that was 3 a good explanation. Have you in your time as 4 HR in Detroit, I'm trying to make it easier on 5 myself, as HR in Detroit ever seen such a 6 reduction in discipline happen more than a year 7 after the discipline took place?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 (Whereupon a document was identified as 10 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.)</p> <p>11 Q Ms. Franz, I've handed you what has 12 been marked as Exhibit 1. And it is the Final 13 Corrective Action Notice for Jason Conover. Do 14 you see that?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q And have you seen this discipline 17 before?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And so this is the discipline that 20 we've been talking about where he requested to 21 have Mr. Culpepper remove him from the RTS 22 system; correct?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And it indicates in the second 25 sentence of the first paragraph that</p>	<p>54</p> <p>1 permission you're referring to?</p> <p>2 A Correct.</p> <p>3 Q And so Mr. Culpepper gave him 4 permission to stay on the clock and get paid 5 while being asleep for the vast majority of his 6 shift?</p> <p>7 A Correct.</p> <p>8 Q So did Mr. Culpepper commit time 9 card fraud in giving an employee permission to 10 be away from his work area asleep while getting 11 paid?</p> <p>12 MR. TUYN: Well, let me just object 13 as to lack of foundation. And I think you're 14 representing facts that aren't in evidence.</p> <p>15 There's no evidence that Culpepper knew that 16 Conover was sleeping. Conover doesn't say 17 that. Culpepper didn't say that.</p> <p>18 So that isn't what Culpepper was 19 disciplined for.</p> <p>20 MS. BROCK: Well, I understand your 21 objection. But this is the HR person who was 22 there. And she was there, and neither of us 23 were. And so although she may not have known 24 he was away sleeping, she certainly knew that 25 Mr. Culpepper is who removed him from the line.</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

19 (Pages 55 to 58)

<p>55</p> <p>1 MR. TUYN: Yeah. And she testified 2 to that. But she didn't testify that Culpepper 3 knew that Conover was sleeping after he took 4 him off the line.</p> <p>5 MS. BROCK: Well, let me ask it this 6 way. Whether she knew he was sleeping or not, 7 whether she knew he was punched in and wasn't 8 working.</p> <p>9 Q When Mr. Culpepper removed 10 Mr. Conover from the RTS line, were you aware 11 as to whether Mr. Culpepper knew that -- well, 12 I take it back.</p> <p>13 Didn't you just tell me that 14 Mr. Conover had permission to be away from his 15 work station?</p> <p>16 A Correct.</p> <p>17 Q He had permission to be punched in 18 and away from his work station?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And Mr. Culpepper is who provided 21 him that permission; correct?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q So was it time card fraud for 24 Mr. Culpepper to have allowed an employee to be 25 away from their work station, not working, and</p>	<p>57</p> <p>1 reasons can that occur?</p> <p>2 A I'm not aware that we've done that.</p> <p>3 Q Right. But I'm representing that we 4 have.</p> <p>5 A Yeah.</p> <p>6 Q So my question to you is: How could 7 that occur, or why could that occur?</p> <p>8 A I can't speak to that. I didn't 9 make that decision.</p> <p>10 Q And have you ever seen an employee 11 punch in and have the entire shift, just about, 12 taken away from them?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q Mr. Conover is the first person 15 that, as far as you know, that's ever occurred 16 for?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And what about Mr. Culpepper's 19 situation where he was docked for four hours of 20 pay that day? Have you ever known of another 21 employee to be on the clock and have their pay 22 taken for four hours?</p> <p>23 A No.</p> <p>24 Q Can you, sitting here today, think 25 of any circumstance where the reaction of</p>
<p>56</p> <p>1 remaining punched in?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q Why not?</p> <p>4 A We have employees who are given 5 authorization to be away from their work area 6 and continue to be paid. That in and of itself 7 would not be considered time card fraud.</p> <p>8 Q What would make it time card fraud?</p> <p>9 A If they didn't have the 10 authorization.</p> <p>11 Q So as long as a supervisor said it 12 was okay for him to be on the clock and away 13 from his work area, not working, it's okay?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q Then why, if you know, was 16 Mr. Conover's pay docked --</p> <p>17 A It wasn't aware.</p> <p>18 Q -- for that time?</p> <p>19 A I wasn't aware of that.</p> <p>20 Q Well, sitting here today now that 21 you are aware, what reasons can an employee's 22 pay be docked? If I'm punched in, if I'm a 23 Delta employee and I'm punched in and I'm 24 punched in an entire shift and management takes 25 my pay for almost the entire shift, for what</p>	<p>58</p> <p>1 management would be to take a person's pay for 2 so many hours that they were punched in?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q Can you, sitting here today, and I 5 know it's tough because a million things could 6 happen that could probably lead to this kind of 7 situation, but sitting here today, can you 8 think of any situation that would warrant 9 management to say, yes, that person was punched 10 in, but we're taking four hours or six hours or 11 more from them of their pay for that day?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q Sitting here today, considering that 14 you didn't become aware of Mr. Conover's pay 15 being docked until today, do you still know 16 whether Mr. Conover committed time card fraud 17 or not? Want me to change the question?</p> <p>18 A Yeah.</p> <p>19 Q Because it's a little icky.</p> <p>20 A I'm not sure I understand.</p> <p>21 Q What I'm asking is, is you don't 22 know why his pay was docked. So can you be 23 sure that he didn't commit time card fraud?</p> <p>24 MR. TUYN: Well, is your question --</p> <p>25 first of all, I don't think we've defined time</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

20 (Pages 59 to 62)

<p>59</p> <p>1 card fraud.</p> <p>2 MS. BROCK: Well, let me have her --</p> <p>3 stop right there. Let me have her define it.</p> <p>4 We can go question by question, and that way</p> <p>5 we'll get every objection you have answered.</p> <p>6 Q What is time card fraud?</p> <p>7 A I would define it as an employee</p> <p>8 being paid for time that they were not on</p> <p>9 property that they didn't have authorization to</p> <p>10 not be on property.</p> <p>11 Q So in order for it to be time card</p> <p>12 fraud in your mind, the person has to be off</p> <p>13 the property?</p> <p>14 A When I say off property, I mean not</p> <p>15 working. Thank you for that clarification.</p> <p>16 Q And so again, my question is:</p> <p>17 Considering that you were not aware that</p> <p>18 Mr. Conover's pay was docked, can you say that</p> <p>19 he was not off property in November of 2012?</p> <p>20 Can you still say that?</p> <p>21 A Repeat that question for me.</p> <p>22 Q Yeah.</p> <p>23 A Because there were --</p> <p>24 Q Considering that you did not know</p> <p>25 his pay was docked --</p>	<p>61</p> <p>1 feel comfortable that you've given me an answer</p> <p>2 to my question?</p> <p>3 A Go ahead and repeat it again for me.</p> <p>4 Q Okay.</p> <p>5 A I'm sorry.</p> <p>6 Q It's okay. I don't mind. I don't</p> <p>7 mind. I plan to be here all day, so it's okay.</p> <p>8 Let me try to walk up to it, and maybe that</p> <p>9 will help us get there.</p> <p>10 At the time that this discipline was</p> <p>11 issued, you were not aware that Mr. Conover's</p> <p>12 pay had been docked almost the entire shift?</p> <p>13 A That's correct.</p> <p>14 Q And you also testified that, based</p> <p>15 on your understanding of what Mr. Conover did,</p> <p>16 that would not be time card fraud; correct?</p> <p>17 A Well, I wasn't aware that -- you're</p> <p>18 putting those two things together. Can you</p> <p>19 rephrase that for me? Because you're putting</p> <p>20 the pieces together, but I wasn't aware of this</p> <p>21 piece.</p> <p>22 Q And I get it.</p> <p>23 A Okay.</p> <p>24 Q And so I'm kind of at your</p> <p>25 before-awareness mind.</p>
<p>60</p> <p>1 A Correct.</p> <p>2 Q -- can you still say he was not off</p> <p>3 property?</p> <p>4 A I don't know. I mean, I don't know</p> <p>5 where he was.</p> <p>6 Q So now you recognize that you really</p> <p>7 didn't know where Mr. Conover was at the time</p> <p>8 that this discipline took place?</p> <p>9 MR. TUYN: Well, your question was</p> <p>10 did he engage in time card fraud.</p> <p>11 MS. BROCK: No. That's not my last</p> <p>12 question. That was the question a few</p> <p>13 questions ago.</p> <p>14 MR. TUYN: Well, I mean, if your</p> <p>15 question is did he do anything wrong, that's</p> <p>16 different than --</p> <p>17 MS. BROCK: No, that's not what I'm</p> <p>18 asking.</p> <p>19 MR. TUYN: -- was it time card</p> <p>20 fraud.</p> <p>21 MS. BROCK: I'm being very specific</p> <p>22 about what I'm asking.</p> <p>23 Q Do you need me to ask it again?</p> <p>24 Because I don't want to get an objection that</p> <p>25 I've asked it and you've answered it. Do you</p>	<p>62</p> <p>1 A Okay.</p> <p>2 Q Before you became aware, so let's</p> <p>3 wipe out that he was docked at this point, from</p> <p>4 what you were told and what you're aware that</p> <p>5 Mr. Conover did, you would not consider that</p> <p>6 time card fraud; correct?</p> <p>7 A That's correct.</p> <p>8 Q Now you have become aware that</p> <p>9 Mr. Conover was actually docked for the vast</p> <p>10 majority of his shift on this November 2012</p> <p>11 day. Can you still say he did not commit time</p> <p>12 card fraud?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q How and why?</p> <p>15 A Because I don't understand why he</p> <p>16 was docked. So until I understood that</p> <p>17 decision, my thought is the same in that it is</p> <p>18 not time card fraud.</p> <p>19 (Whereupon a document was identified as</p> <p>20 Plaintiff's Exhibit 2.)</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Now I need to ask a similar</p> <p>22 set of questions about Mr. Culpepper, but I</p> <p>23 think it will be easier for him because we got</p> <p>24 through it on Mr. Conover.</p> <p>25 Before we get to Exhibit 2,</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

21 (Pages 63 to 66)

<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 Exhibit 1 indicates that Mr. Conover was being 2 investigated for time card fraud. Is it your 3 understanding today that, although he was 4 investigated for time card fraud, he wasn't 5 disciplined for time card fraud?</p> <p>6 A That is my understanding, yes.</p> <p>7 Q Then what was Mr. -- I mean, looking 8 at this discipline, I need to see what are we 9 saying in this paper that Mr. Conover was 10 disciplined for.</p> <p>11 MR. TUYN: And before you respond, 12 make sure you read it.</p> <p>13 MS. BROCK: Oh, absolutely. I'm in 14 no hurry today.</p> <p>15 A Okay.</p> <p>16 Q So what was, according to the 17 discipline, Mr. Conover disciplined for? He 18 was investigated for time card fraud. What was 19 he disciplined for?</p> <p>20 A In reading this, job performance.</p> <p>21 Q Isn't it true that Delta considers 22 any disciplinary action a performance 23 opportunity?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q So when you say when it says</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">65</p> <p>1 A Based on what this says, not being 2 in his work area.</p> <p>3 Q And you know I've asked this a bunch 4 of different ways at this point. Have you ever 5 known of an employee to be docked pay for poor 6 performance?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Ms. Franz, taking a look at what has 9 been marked Exhibit 2, we see a corrective 10 action notice regarding performance, and it's 11 for Christopher Culpepper. Do you see that?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And this also indicates that he was 14 being investigated for time card fraud, yeah, 15 in that second sentence of the first paragraph. 16 Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And so for Mr. Culpepper, what was 19 he actually disciplined for? I understand he 20 was investigated for time card fraud. But what 21 was he disciplined for?</p> <p>22 A He was disciplined for using his ALA 23 authority when he was not in an ALA capacity.</p> <p>24 Q And he was also demoted; correct?</p> <p>25 A That is correct.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1 performance, couldn't it very well be just a 2 performance opportunity?</p> <p>3 A What do you mean by that?</p> <p>4 Q Yeah. It's a phrase. Mr. Domingo 5 De La Torre told me that Delta uses a general 6 term in his testimony, and it's performance 7 opportunities, that we try to work through 8 performance opportunities. We give disciplines 9 to try to improve performance, but that would 10 be for anything that we discipline you for, is 11 to improve performance.</p> <p>12 A No. Every discipline is not going 13 to say job performance.</p> <p>14 Q Or it's going to say attendance, or 15 it's going to say safety.</p> <p>16 A Or it could say conduct.</p> <p>17 Q What about Mr. Conover's performance 18 caused him to receive this discipline?</p> <p>19 MR. TUYN: We're still talking about 20 Conover?</p> <p>21 MS. BROCK: We are.</p> <p>22 A Can you repeat that question for 23 me?</p> <p>24 Q Sure. What about Mr. Conover's 25 performance caused him to be disciplined?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">66</p> <p>1 Q And your understanding per your 2 testimony is that Culpepper gave Conover 3 permission to remain punched in and be away 4 from his work station; correct?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q In the giving an employee permission 7 to be, based on your understanding -- I'm not 8 saying it happened that way, but that's your 9 understanding of it. For an ALA to give 10 permission to an employee to be punched in and 11 away from their work station, is that time card 12 fraud?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q Why not?</p> <p>15 A They have the authorization to do 16 so.</p> <p>17 Q So an ALA can actually tell an 18 employee, you can stay punched in and not work?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And make sure they -- and they still 21 can get paid for that?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Wow. Now, with Mr. Culpepper and 24 the fact, and I know it's not discussed in this 25 discipline, the fact that he was on the clock</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

22 (Pages 67 to 70)

<p style="text-align: right;">67</p> <p>1 and not working for part of his shift, would 2 that be considered time card fraud? 3 A Repeat that for me. 4 Q Sure. Mr. Culpepper, he was punched 5 in, and he didn't work for part of his shift. 6 Would that be considered time card fraud? 7 A If he did not have authorization, 8 yes. 9 Q Is it your position that 10 Mr. Culpepper was not disciplined for time card 11 fraud? 12 A Yes. 13 Q And how come? How come that's your 14 position that it wasn't time card fraud? 15 A Because the discipline was for his 16 misuse of his ALA authority. 17 Q Sitting here today now that you know 18 some additional information, are you sure that 19 his discipline was for the misuse of his 20 authority? 21 A That's what it says. 22 Q So as far as you know, he didn't get 23 disciplined for being punched in and not 24 working part of his shift? 25 A That's my understanding.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">69</p> <p>1 Exhibit 2 says Corrective Action Notice 2 Regarding Performance, and Exhibit 3 is a 3 written coaching. Do you see that? 4 A Yes. 5 Q And again it says he was 6 investigated for time card fraud. Do you see 7 that? 8 A Yes. 9 Q And then I think there's a couple of 10 other differences. If you turn the page, you 11 will see that in that second paragraph on the 12 second page the amount of time that the 13 discipline would remain in his journal has been 14 changed. Do you see that? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And let's go back to the signature 17 date. Mr. Culpepper signed Exhibit 2 November 18 21st of 2012; correct? 19 A Yes. 20 Q He signed Exhibit 3, his written 21 coaching for the same infraction, January 15th 22 of 2014; correct? 23 A Yes. 24 Q So that was a year and two, three 25 months after the original signature; correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">68</p> <p>1 Q Now, I've represented to you today 2 that Mr. Culpepper was docked for four hours, 3 but I think you've already testified that you 4 have no reason why he would have been docked 5 for four hours of pay for that day. 6 A I'm not aware of that. 7 (Whereupon a document was identified as 8 Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.) 9 Q Ms. Franz, you've been handed 10 Exhibit 3. And it is a Written Coaching Notice 11 Regarding Performance for Christopher 12 Culpepper. Do you see that? 13 A Yes. 14 Q And if you turn the page, we're 15 going to come back, but if you just turn the 16 page, you'll see that it's dated January 15th 17 of 2014; correct? 18 A Yes. 19 Q And you would have still been the HR 20 manager at that point; correct? 21 A Yes. 22 Q If you look back at the first page 23 and you compare it to Exhibit 2, you will 24 notice that it's all the same except for the 25 title. You see where the title is changed?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">70</p> <p>1 A Yes. 2 Q Before today, were you aware that 3 Mr. Culpepper's discipline had been reduced in 4 this manner? 5 A Before today? 6 Q Yes. 7 A Yes. 8 Q Before yesterday, were you aware 9 that Mr. Culpepper's discipline was reduced in 10 this manner? 11 A No. 12 Q In your role as human resource 13 generalist/manager for Delta, what involvement, 14 if any, did you have in terminating employees? 15 A I'm involved. Can you -- 16 Q And what is your role? 17 A Okay. Thank you. I may -- the 18 role's going to vary based upon the 19 circumstances. I may be part of the 20 investigation and then the subsequent 21 termination or -- but always, I am involved in 22 reviewing the termination file and the 23 recommendation for termination from the 24 operation. 25 Q I'm sorry for taking you back and</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

23 (Pages 71 to 74)

<p>1 forth. I just had a thought. We talked about 2 you seeing the disciplinary file for 3 Mr. Conover, and we talked about the fact that 4 you saw several documents. You talked about 5 the statements from, oh, from both Culpepper 6 and Conover.</p> <p>7 The summary from the PL or 8 department manager, was there a summary for 9 both Conover and Culpepper?</p> <p>10 A I don't recall.</p> <p>11 Q If there was no summary for one or 12 the other -- well, let me ask it this way. Do 13 you remember there being a summary for one of 14 them?</p> <p>15 A I remember there being a summary.</p> <p>16 Q And your remembrance right now is of 17 one summary, it sounds like. Is that the case?</p> <p>18 A I can't recall.</p> <p>19 Q But you know there was a summary. 20 You don't know if there was one or two, and you 21 don't know for which individual?</p> <p>22 A Correct.</p> <p>23 MR. TUYN: Before you go any 24 further, can we take a break?</p> <p>25 MS. BROCK: Yeah. If you can just</p>	<p>71</p> <p>1 addition to what you were provided for 2 Mr. Culpepper?</p> <p>3 A That's correct.</p> <p>4 Q Would Mr. Culpepper's investigatory 5 file also be in your former office to the best 6 of your knowledge?</p> <p>7 A I don't know.</p> <p>8 Q That's where you left it?</p> <p>9 A I don't -- I don't specifically know 10 if, this particular investigation, there's a 11 file in my office for it.</p> <p>12 MS. BROCK: Okay. I understand. 13 And I can appreciate that. We can get a break.</p> <p>14 MR. TUYN: Okay.</p> <p>15 (Proceedings in recess, 10:30 a.m. to 16 10:43 a.m.)</p> <p>17 Q Before we took the break, we had 18 gotten over into the Conover-Culpepper world 19 once again, and now I'm back to the termination 20 world. And I had asked you before we went back 21 to Conover and Culpepper about your role as a 22 human resource generalist/manager in the 23 termination process.</p> <p>24 And you did provide me with some of 25 your responsibilities in that regard. And one</p>	<p>72</p>	<p>73</p>
<p>1 let me finish about what was in Culpepper's, 2 and I won't ask anything outside of that.</p> <p>3 MR. TUYN: Okay.</p> <p>4 Q So you can't recall whether it was 5 for one or the other of them or whether it was 6 just one that covered both of them. You just 7 can't recall?</p> <p>8 A Right.</p> <p>9 Q But you know there was a summary. 10 Yes?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q For any information that was not in 13 the summary, you would have had to have asked 14 the PL or the department manager what was going 15 on; correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And I'm almost done with this line. 18 For Culpepper, I know I asked for Conover, did 19 you see any Kronos punches in that 20 investigatory file for Culpepper?</p> <p>21 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>22 Q Did you see any County swipes for 23 that investigatory file for Culpepper?</p> <p>24 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>25 Q And you didn't pull anything in</p>	<p>1 of them in particular that I noted was that you 2 review the file. And when you review the 3 termination file, what are you looking for?</p> <p>4 A I'm looking for the reason that the 5 operation is recommending to term. I'm looking 6 to see if that's supportive with the infraction 7 or the policy violation. And I'm looking for 8 documentation to support that decision.</p> <p>9 Q Do you conduct any independent 10 investigation into the termination files when 11 you receive them?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q So your decision as far as whether 14 to recommend termination or not recommend 15 termination is based on the file that the 16 management or operations side would have put 17 together and sent to you?</p> <p>18 A There may be additional questions or 19 additional documentation that isn't in the file 20 that I asked for, but I don't do an 21 investigation.</p> <p>22 Q Have you ever in your time as Delta 23 HR in Detroit denied or recommended that a 24 termination -- a recommended termination not 25 take place?</p>	<p>72</p>	<p>74</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

24 (Pages 75 to 78)

1 A Yes. 2 Q Under what circumstances have you, 3 and it doesn't have to be specific to one 4 person, under what circumstances have you 5 recommended that a recommended termination not 6 take place? 7 A If any of those things that I'm 8 looking for are not in the file. So if the 9 decision is not consistent with what we've done 10 in the past as far as the infraction, if 11 there's not documented evidence of what took 12 place, there's stuff missing, then it -- yeah. 13 Q And have you had any occasion where 14 the operations side didn't accept your 15 recommendation that termination not take place? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Under what circumstances have they 18 not taken your recommendation? 19 A I can't give you a specific 20 circumstance. 21 Q In the instances when the operations 22 side did not accept your recommendation for 23 termination, did you exercise your option of 24 taking it up the management chain? 25 A Every time.	75 1 about the type of compliance call or compliance 2 calls in general? 3 Q The type. I'm talking about -- 4 A I couldn't speak to -- 5 Q -- racial discrimination. 6 A -- the type. I'm sorry. I thought 7 you were asking about compliance calls in 8 general. 9 Q Have you ever done a race 10 discrimination compliance call other than the 11 one involving Jerrick Rodrigues? 12 A I can't speak to the specifics of 13 the previous compliance calls. 14 Q And I understand that. 15 A Yeah. 16 Q So sitting here today, is it safe to 17 say you have no recollection of doing a race 18 discrimination call from the hot line other 19 than Mr. Rodrigues, the one involving 20 Mr. Rodrigues? 21 A I have no recollection of the 22 previous topics of the compliance calls. 23 MR. TUYN: And just to clarify, 24 you're saying the one concerning Mr. Rodrigues, 25 but I assume you're grouping. There were six
76 1 Q And taking it up the management 2 chain, were you able to get the termination 3 reversed or the recommendation to terminate 4 reversed? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Was the Rodrigues, Beydoun, and 7 Leela termination the first ethics compliance 8 hot line investigation you conducted? 9 A No. 10 Q How many ethics hot line 11 investigations would you estimate that you've 12 conducted in your career as a Delta HR 13 manager/HR person? 14 A I don't know. 15 Q Well, let me get a range. Was it 16 ten times? Because it's a long career, but I 17 don't know if you get -- I guess what I'm 18 trying to sense, is it a high volume or is it a 19 low volume of hot line calls for Detroit for 20 race discrimination. 21 Would you say less than ten in your 22 career there? 23 A No. 24 Q Less than 20? 25 A Well, are you specifically talking	78 1 different hot line complaints that essentially 2 said the same thing. 3 MS. BROCK: Yeah. 4 MR. TUYN: Or that mention Rodrigues 5 in one vein or another. 6 MS. BROCK: Yeah. 7 MR. TUYN: So when you say the one, 8 you're talking about the six? 9 MS. BROCK: Yeah. 10 Q So outside of that one, you have no 11 recollection -- 12 A Yeah, no, I don't. 13 Q Let me ask you this. Have you, 14 since you can't remember any specific 15 investigation or any specific topics of 16 investigation, have you ever found that Delta 17 did commit race discrimination in one of your 18 investigations? 19 A No. 20 Q And you didn't find that Delta 21 committed race discrimination as to 22 Mr. Rodrigues; correct? 23 A Correct. 24 (Whereupon a document was identified as 25 Plaintiff's Exhibit 4.)

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

25 (Pages 79 to 82)

<p>1 Q Ms. Franz you've been handed what 2 has been marked as Exhibit 4, and it appears to 3 be a policy of Delta's. Am I correct in that? 4 A Looks like it, yes. 5 Q Have you ever seen this policy 6 before? 7 A Yes. 8 Q Now, it indicates that Delta is 9 committed to a workplace free from 10 discrimination. And that's in the very first, 11 We Value Diversity paragraph? 12 A Uh-huh (affirmative). 13 Q Yes? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Have you found that Delta is 16 committed to a workplace free from 17 discrimination? 18 A Yes. 19 Q And then moving down a little bit, 20 it says, "Discrimination Is Not Tolerated." 21 Have you found that Delta does not tolerate 22 discrimination? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Have you ever known of anyone to be 25 terminated for discriminating?</p>	79	<p>1 discrimination, harassment, and the like. And 2 it says you can report it to your leader, your 3 manager, the HR professional, or the equal 4 opportunity department. Where is that 5 department located? 6 A Here in Atlanta. 7 Q And the equal opportunity 8 department, is the method by which to contact 9 them published somewhere? Like how would I 10 call them? 11 A The directory, the corporate 12 directory. 13 Q That corporate directory, is it 14 online? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And does it direct you to any one 17 person, or do you just call the department? 18 Would you just call that department? 19 A You would call the department. Or 20 if you knew the name, you could search for a 21 name as well. 22 Q And then it continues that you may 23 also call Delta's ethics and compliance help 24 line. I've been calling it a hot line, so I 25 probably will not be able to stop calling it a</p>	81
<p>1 A No. 2 Q Do you know of anyone ever being 3 disciplined for discrimination? 4 A No. 5 Q Have you ever known of anyone being 6 investigated for discrimination other than the 7 one set of investigations you conducted with 8 Jerrick Rodrigues? And I know I asked you for 9 you, but I'm just talking generally now. Not 10 necessarily investigations that you performed, 11 per se, but have you ever known of anyone to be 12 investigated for race discrimination? 13 A To be able to give specifics of 14 that, no. 15 Q Even without the specifics, are you 16 aware of anyone being investigated for race 17 discrimination? 18 A Yes. 19 Q And to the best of your knowledge, 20 whatever person, whatever group of people, 21 whatever situations you're thinking of, was it 22 found that discrimination existed? 23 A Not that I recall. 24 Q In the very last paragraph on 25 Exhibit 4, it talks about reporting any kind of</p>	80	<p>1 hot line. 2 A Okay. 3 Q So if I say hot line, I mean Delta's 4 ethics and compliance help line. Okay? What 5 is the purpose of the hot line? 6 A To report concerns to Delta. 7 Q Is it any other purpose other than 8 just reporting? Is it to try to get a concern 9 resolved or fixed or corrected, or is it just 10 to report it? 11 A I would say it's all those things. 12 (Whereupon a document was identified as 13 Plaintiff's Exhibit 5.) 14 Q Mr. Franz, you've been handed 15 Exhibit 5, and it is what appears to be a 16 policy entitled Personnel Conduct Standards and 17 Appearance Guidelines. Do you see that? 18 A Yes. 19 Q Am I correct that this is a policy? 20 A It appears to be, yes. 21 MR. TUYN: Well, objection. It says 22 guideline. 23 Q Well, let me ask. What's the 24 difference between a guideline and a policy? 25 A In my definition, a policy would be</p>	82

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

26 (Pages 83 to 86)

<p>1 this is -- it's black and white. A guideline 2 may be gray. 3 Q Am I correct that you don't have to 4 follow a guideline? 5 A No. 6 Q So you do have to follow a 7 guideline? 8 A But it's a guideline, so there could 9 be room to do something potentially 10 differently. 11 Q So you don't have to 100 percent 12 follow a guideline? 13 A Yes. 14 Q Do you have to 100 percent follow a 15 policy? 16 A Yes. That's my definition. 17 Q Well, you're the HR manager. 18 A I'm just -- 19 Q Now, you're a senior person, so I'm 20 willing to take your word for it. And the 21 first page, you will see, is just a cover 22 sheet. I just wanted to have something so we 23 could know what this document is, but I did not 24 put every page of it. 25 You'll see the numbers at the bottom</p>	83	<p>1 program," and then it says, "which primarily 2 consists of the following policies and 3 objectives." Do you see that? 4 A Yes. 5 Q So those things that are listed 6 directly under that sentence, would that be 7 the, to the best of your knowledge, "the equal 8 opportunity program," quote-unquote? 9 A Yes. 10 Q Now, understanding that the entire 11 document is a guideline, but it indicates here 12 that these are policies and objectives. So 13 with that, does that mean that these bullet 14 points are things that you have to follow? 15 They're policies? 16 A Well, some are objectives. 17 Q Tell me which ones are policies and 18 which ones are objectives. 19 A I wouldn't be comfortable 20 differentiating that. 21 Q Is that safe to say that you're 22 unsure which ones are policies and objectives? 23 A I'm unsure how they would -- how 24 equal opportunity would define it. 25 Q Is this policy only interpreted by</p>	85
<p>1 kind of skip because I didn't need all of the 2 sections and I didn't want to ask you about all 3 of the sections. But I thought it was only 4 fair if I kind of told you where it came from, 5 so to speak. 6 The second page has a 7 nondiscrimination policy. Do you see that 8 there? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And it indicates that in that first 11 paragraph near the bottom right before you get 12 to the first bullet point, it says, "The 13 Director - Equal Opportunity is responsible for 14 coordinating the day-to-day implementation of 15 Delta's equal opportunity program." 16 Do you know who the director - equal 17 opportunity is? 18 A Well, the head of equal opportunity 19 is Melissa Seppings. I'm not sure if that's 20 her title. 21 Q And it says the date -- have you 22 seen this document before, first of all? 23 A I have. 24 Q It says, "the day-to-day 25 implementation of Delta's equal opportunity</p>	84	<p>1 equal opportunity, or do you use it in your 2 day-to-day work as an HR manager? 3 A I would use the first bullet. I 4 would not use the second bullet. I don't 5 conduct business with outside firms. So some 6 of it, yes, and some of it, no. 7 Q So as to that first bullet, is that 8 a policy or an objective? 9 A I would say it's a policy. 10 Q The last bullet, "ensuring 11 compliance with applicable laws," is that a 12 bullet that you would make use of? 13 A Yes. 14 Q I understand why two and probably 15 three you may not day-to-day make use of. 16 Would bullet number four be a policy or an 17 objective? 18 A I would say it's a policy. 19 Q In that paragraph under the fourth 20 bullet point, it says, "involved as well as the 21 company's obligations as a federal government 22 contractor." So Delta is a federal government 23 contractor? 24 A That's what it says. 25 Q Are you aware of whether they're a</p>	86

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

27 (Pages 87 to 90)

<p style="text-align: right;">87</p> <p>1 federal contractor?</p> <p>2 A I am not.</p> <p>3 Q Have you ever seen -- in the last</p> <p>4 sentence, it indicates implementation of the</p> <p>5 company's affirmative action plan. Have you</p> <p>6 ever seen the company's affirmative action plan</p> <p>7 before?</p> <p>8 A I've seen the Detroit plan, not</p> <p>9 necessarily the whole company's.</p> <p>10 Q And under what circumstances did you</p> <p>11 come to see the Detroit affirmative action</p> <p>12 plan?</p> <p>13 A We're provided a copy every year.</p> <p>14 Q What can you tell me about Detroit's</p> <p>15 affirmative action plan? What is the Detroit</p> <p>16 affirmative action plan?</p> <p>17 A I wouldn't be able to speak to the</p> <p>18 specifics.</p> <p>19 Q You receive it every year?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Did you read it every year?</p> <p>22 A Cover to cover? No.</p> <p>23 Q Did you read any of it every year?</p> <p>24 A Yeah.</p> <p>25 Q The part that you read, what did it</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>1 A Well, I read it so I would know.</p> <p>2 Q Would you take any action based on</p> <p>3 the numbers that are reported? Would you take</p> <p>4 any action as far as hiring? Would you create</p> <p>5 a retention plan? Would you do anything in</p> <p>6 particular after you review those numbers?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Based on your remembrance, the</p> <p>9 numbers that you saw in that report, were they</p> <p>10 satisfactory to you as far as the number of</p> <p>11 minorities that were employed within Delta at</p> <p>12 Detroit?</p> <p>13 A There was nothing that stuck out, so</p> <p>14 yes.</p> <p>15 Q Were there as many, to the best of</p> <p>16 your remembrance, African-Americans employed</p> <p>17 with Delta in Detroit as Caucasians?</p> <p>18 A I don't recall.</p> <p>19 Q But nothing stuck out in your mind?</p> <p>20 A Correct.</p> <p>21 Q Well, you worked there for quite</p> <p>22 some time. When you left the Detroit location,</p> <p>23 were there just as many African-Americans</p> <p>24 employed there as white employees?</p> <p>25 A I couldn't speak to that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">88</p> <p>1 say?</p> <p>2 A The part that I reviewed was the</p> <p>3 demographic information.</p> <p>4 Q And when you say "the demographic</p> <p>5 information," is it the information that you</p> <p>6 yourself would be reporting or your department</p> <p>7 as to how many of each group works there?</p> <p>8 A I wouldn't report it. But yes,</p> <p>9 it's that information.</p> <p>10 Q Does it have any goals of where you</p> <p>11 would want to be as to those relative race</p> <p>12 categories?</p> <p>13 A I don't believe so. It may. I</p> <p>14 don't recall.</p> <p>15 Q And you would review those</p> <p>16 statistical -- that statistical data and</p> <p>17 information for Detroit for what reason?</p> <p>18 A For knowledge.</p> <p>19 Q What would you do with that</p> <p>20 knowledge? Anything in particular? I guess</p> <p>21 I'm trying to find out, did you do something?</p> <p>22 Do you read it and see the numbers and say,</p> <p>23 hey, we need to work on this or that? Or do</p> <p>24 you just read it and you just -- so you can</p> <p>25 just know?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>1 (Whereupon a document was identified as</p> <p>2 Plaintiff's Exhibit 6.)</p> <p>3 Q You've been handed Exhibit 6,</p> <p>4 Ms. Franz, and it is a document entitled</p> <p>5 Reliability. Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And this appears to be a</p> <p>8 Delta-issued document; is that correct?</p> <p>9 A It looks familiar. The formatting</p> <p>10 looks a little bit different, but yes.</p> <p>11 Q Good. I'm glad you said that.</p> <p>12 Looking at the bottom where it says Personnel</p> <p>13 Practices Manual, what is the Personnel</p> <p>14 Practices Manual?</p> <p>15 A Yeah, we don't have that anymore.</p> <p>16 Q And when was the Personnel Practices</p> <p>17 Manual done away with?</p> <p>18 A Well, it wasn't necessarily done</p> <p>19 away with. It was reformatted. I don't recall</p> <p>20 when that occurred.</p> <p>21 Q Has this policy -- well, let me ask.</p> <p>22 Is this a policy? Is Exhibit 6 a policy?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Was this policy rolled over into the</p> <p>25 on-the-road document or off-the-road document?</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

28 (Pages 91 to 94)

<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>1 A No. 2 Q I don't recall -- am I'm using the 3 right name? 4 A I don't think you're using the right 5 term. 6 Q I'm not using the right name. 7 There's a manual that I saw, and it has a big 8 airplane on the front of it. And it says 9 either on-the-road or off-the-road. I can't 10 remember. 11 A Well, there's Rules of the Road. 12 But no, this would not be in that document. 13 Q Where was this document rolled over 14 into? Where is it now? 15 A The term that's used, I believe, 16 online is -- I don't know exactly what it's 17 called. I think the link says People Policies. 18 (Whereupon a document was identified as 19 Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.) 20 Q You've been handed Exhibit 7. And 21 it appears to be the same as Exhibit 6, but 22 it's kind of set up a little bit different. Is 23 this what you're meaning when you said it's 24 like been reformatted? 25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 Other types of policies? 2 A No. Well, Operational Policies. 3 (Whereupon a document was identified as 4 Plaintiff's Exhibit 8.) 5 Q I've handed you what has been marked 6 as Exhibit 8, and it is a Topics Discussed with 7 Agent for Jerrick Rodriques. Do you see that? 8 A Yes. 9 Q And would this be Mr. Rodriques's 10 journal? 11 A No. 12 Q What is the journal? I haven't been 13 able to get a sense of what is the journal. If 14 this isn't the journal, what is the journal? 15 A Well, I wouldn't call this a 16 journal. This is the Northwest equivalent of 17 the journal. So this is the electronic 18 performance development system. We called it 19 EPD. It's equivalent to the journal, but I 20 would not call this a journal. 21 Q How would I know that I have the 22 journal? What would I see that lets me know I 23 have the journal? 24 A You would see dates and 25 documentation of conversation that was -- that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>1 Q So the way that you recall seeing it 2 is how it looks in Exhibit 7; correct? 3 A I recall seeing it in both formats, 4 but 7 is the more recent. 5 Q And we don't know when the format 6 changed? 7 A I do not. 8 Q What is regular and predictable 9 attendance? 10 A Are you asking me what that means? 11 Q Yes. 12 A So regular and predictable 13 attendance, to me, means that you are reliable 14 and you come to work. 15 Q Where can the reliability policy be 16 found? 17 A On the company intranet site. 18 Q Intranet. Intranet? 19 A Yes. 20 Q And that's under People Policies; 21 correct? 22 A Yes. 23 Q What are the other headers that you 24 can remember? Because People Policies is an 25 odd phrase. What other ones do they have?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 took place with Mr. Rodriques. 2 Q Is this document Exhibit 8 still 3 utilized? 4 A No. 5 Q When did Delta stop utilizing this 6 Exhibit 8? 7 A Around March of -- well, I'm not 8 sure. 9 Q Okay. It says -- and that may 10 explain why it says it. That was my question. 11 It says, "Manager: Manager does not exist." 12 Why? 13 A The system wasn't that robust to 14 feed that. Everybody's would have said manager 15 does not exist. 16 Q And then it says, "Manager 17 reassignment on March 12, '12." Do you know 18 why it says that? 19 A No. 20 Q And then up under that, it says, 21 "Document Code S, nature of document, manager." 22 Are those just the headings for each of those 23 lines underneath? 24 A Yes. 25 Q And then there's a March -- I don't</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

29 (Pages 95 to 98)

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

30 (Pages 99 to 102)

99	101
<p>1 Q Did you in fact meet with 2 Mr. De La Torre to go over the documents in the 3 RFT file?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And what assistance did 6 Mr. De La Torre need that he wanted to go over 7 the file with you? What did he need you to do?</p> <p>8 A That's normal. That's normal 9 protocol.</p> <p>10 Q And what was the purpose in him 11 going over the file with you?</p> <p>12 A To show why he was recommending him 13 for termination.</p> <p>14 (Whereupon a document was identified as 15 Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.)</p> <p>16 Q Exhibit 11 is dated December 18th, 17 2012. It looks like it's a memo, and it's 18 signed by you. Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And the first sentence of the 21 document says Note to File regarding Jerrick 22 Rodrigues. A note to what file?</p> <p>23 A His employment file.</p> <p>24 Q And you began the next sentence 25 reporting the investigation into</p>	<p>1 line actually turned green indicating he had 2 punched in?</p> <p>3 A When you say who, who are you 4 referring to?</p> <p>5 Q De La Torre.</p> <p>6 A He did not indicate that.</p> <p>7 Q Did he indicate what Mr. Kotula had 8 done to try to substantiate Mr. Rodrigues's 9 whereabouts on that day?</p> <p>10 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>11 Q So for the November 17th, November 12 20th, and December 11th dates that are on this 13 memo to the file or note to the file, you 14 weren't directly involved in any of these 15 steps, were you?</p> <p>16 A That's correct.</p> <p>17 Q Why is it you that wrote the note 18 summary versus the individual who was involved, 19 like Mr. De La Torre? Why would you write the 20 summary versus him?</p> <p>21 A I would -- this is my summary based 22 upon what I saw in the file and my conversation 23 with Domingo.</p> <p>24 (Whereupon a document was identified as 25 Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.)</p>
100	102
<p>1 Mr. Rodrigues's time card records, but dot, 2 dot, dot. Who conducted the investigation?</p> <p>3 A Domingo.</p> <p>4 Q My mind is jumping, so my apologies. 5 Could Mr. Culpepper have been demoted without 6 his DM being aware?</p> <p>7 A I don't believe so.</p> <p>8 Q Could he have been demoted without 9 the general manager being aware?</p> <p>10 A I don't think so.</p> <p>11 Q In the 11-17, back to Exhibit 11, 12 11-17 of '12 summary of information, you give 13 some information in regard to Mr. Rodrigues and 14 what occurred on November 17th. And you're 15 welcome to take a moment and read to refresh 16 your memory.</p> <p>17 Where did you get that information 18 from that's provided under November 17th of 19 2012?</p> <p>20 A Domingo.</p> <p>21 Q Did Mr. De La Torre tell you where 22 he got that information?</p> <p>23 A From Mr. Kotula.</p> <p>24 Q Did he tell you whether he looked 25 into it to see whether Mr. Rodrigues's task</p>	<p>1 Q Exhibit 12 is an internal memo dated 2 December 18th of 2012 from you to Tyesha Gray 3 regarding Mr. Rodrigues; correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And why did you send this memo to 6 Ms. Gray?</p> <p>7 A This is part of our recommendation 8 for term process.</p> <p>9 Q And do you know why the process 10 requires this to be sent to Ms. Gray?</p> <p>11 A She's my boss.</p> <p>12 Q Are you just making her aware? Are 13 you, as is indicated at the bottom, seeking her 14 approval? What's the reason for sending it?</p> <p>15 A So the reason is the operation is 16 recommending his termination. I'm supporting 17 it. So I'm sending it to her to get her 18 support as well.</p> <p>19 Q Did you and Mr. De La Torre discuss 20 any discipline short of termination for 21 Mr. Rodrigues?</p> <p>22 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>23 Q Did you and Ms. Gray discuss any 24 discipline short of termination for 25 Mr. Rodrigues?</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

31 (Pages 103 to 106)

<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>1 A Not that I recall. 2 Q Would you have been willing to hold 3 that conversation if Mohammad Sarsour would 4 have recommended something short of 5 termination? 6 A We would have had discussion. 7 Q Would you have had that discussion 8 if Mr. De La Torre would have recommended 9 something short of termination? 10 A We would have had discussion, yes. 11 Q And of course, because it didn't 12 happen, you can't say today whether you would 13 have agreed to that or not, can you? 14 A No. 15 Q Now, this particular memo to 16 Ms. Gray doesn't list the dates, you know, 17 like, and I'm going to show you shortly, 18 Mr. De La Torre actually put the dates and what 19 was done. Your memo to Ms. Gray didn't include 20 that detail. Why not? 21 A That's not -- I wouldn't include 22 that. What I'm focused on is what is the 23 violation that was -- what is the violation or 24 the policy that was violated. That's what I'm 25 intending to speak to.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">105</p> <p>1 on the 11th? 2 A Yes. 3 Q And then the next line says, "RFT 4 approval received; VP senior leader." What 5 does that mean? 6 A That means we've spoken to the 7 senior leader in the station. 8 Q Which was who? 9 A At the time, it would have been 10 Andrew Zarras. 11 Q Give me the name again. 12 A Andrew Zarras, Z-A-R-R-A-S. 13 Q And what is Mr. Zarras's role? 14 A He was the vice president. 15 Q And so who would have spoken to him? 16 A Most likely Mr. Kriksciun. 17 Q And when you say he would have been 18 spoken to, for what reason? 19 A We're recommending termination of 20 this employee and here's why and to gain his 21 support. 22 Q RFT approval received, what does 23 that mean? 24 A Rec for term approval received. 25 Q The recommendation for termination</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>1 (Whereupon a document was identified as 2 Plaintiff's Exhibit 13.) 3 Q Exhibit 13 is a checklist or appears 4 to be a checklist for recommendation of 5 termination of Mr. Rodrigues. Do you see that? 6 A Yes. 7 Q And I know his name isn't on it, but 8 I believe it's for Mr. Rodrigues. Now, the 9 second box says, "Date MSS transaction 10 completed." What does that mean? 11 A It's a manager self-service. That's 12 our system where the leaders would put in 13 transactions for employees. 14 Q What kind of transactions for 15 employees? 16 A In this particular case, it would 17 have been a suspension transaction. 18 Q Now, the date that this indicates 19 that the suspension transaction was put in is 20 December 11th. Am I correct that Mr. Rodrigues 21 was suspended on the 12th? 22 A Well, he would have been spoken to 23 on the 11th, so the suspension would have been 24 effective the 12th. 25 Q And so his suspension was keyed in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">106</p> <p>1 approval received. So that means that this VP 2 person, Mr. Zarras, approved the recommendation 3 of termination? 4 A Correct. 5 Q And that approval was on -- can you 6 read that date there? 7 A I would say that's 12-13. 8 Q Me too. And so the actual 9 recommendation for termination was approved the 10 day after the effective date of Mr. Rodrigues's 11 suspension? 12 A From Mr. Zarras. 13 Q From Mr. Zarras. The day after the 14 suspension? 15 A (Nods head affirmatively.) 16 Q Yes? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And although the recommendation for 19 termination was approved the day after his 20 suspension, it still wasn't actually effective 21 until January of 2013. Do you know why? 22 A Well, there's a process in between 23 that. 24 Q I understand. But that's still a 25 long time. So do you know why it took from --</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

32 (Pages 107 to 110)

<p>1 everything at metro level, I'm going to call 2 it, was completed by December 13th of 2012. 3 A No, it wasn't. 4 Q Why did it take -- 5 A Because -- did we look at -- because 6 I met with Domingo on the 17th. 7 Q So -- 8 A Right, so -- 9 Q -- the senior VP approved it before 10 you did? 11 A Yes. 12 Q So he didn't know the position HR 13 was going to take at the time that he approved 14 it? 15 A Correct. 16 Q The VP, is he only a VP over like 17 operations? 18 A He would be the VP of airport 19 customer service, so the above and below-wing. 20 (Whereupon a document was identified as 21 Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.) 22 Q Exhibit 14, it's another e-mail. 23 And it's an e-mail from you to Nhia Francis 24 dated December 18th of 2012. And it states -- 25 so the original report you received -- oh,</p>	<p>107</p> <p>1 that you requested after you were provided the 2 file to review? 3 A Yes. 4 Q The same thing about the swipes, the 5 County swipes. Were the County swipes in the 6 file for Mr. Rodriques when you actually 7 received it? 8 A I don't recall. They should have 9 been in the file when I sent it. I don't know 10 if they were in it originally. 11 Q So Ms. Francis did ultimately send 12 you those November 17th punches; correct? 13 A Yes. 14 (Whereupon a document was identified as 15 Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.) 16 Q Exhibit 15 is an e-mail from you to 17 Mr. De La Torre dated December 18th, 2012, at 18 12:44. And you say to him, "Please see the 19 attached punches." Did you send him some of 20 the punches that you had received from 21 Ms. Francis? 22 A It appears that way, yes. 23 Q You don't remember, though? 24 A Specifically, no. By reading the 25 e-mail, yes, that's what occurred.</p>
<p>108</p> <p>1 yeah, that the 17th was not on the report sheet 2 that you received for punches; correct? 3 A Well, there were several that 4 weren't, according to this e-mail. 5 Q So you had to request from her his 6 punches because he had already been suspended; 7 correct? 8 A The data, yes. 9 Q Because you couldn't get them out of 10 Kronos because he had already been suspended? 11 A I would not have been able to get 12 them out of Kronos, period. I don't have 13 access to Kronos. But our attendance 14 coordinator would not have been. 15 Q And so you had not seen any of his 16 punches. Or let me ask it a different way. 17 Were any of his punches printed 18 prior to this request to your knowledge? 19 A Not to my knowledge. 20 Q So when you got the RFT file, the 21 punches, the Kronos punches for Mr. Rodriques, 22 would they have been in that file at the time 23 you received it? 24 A No. 25 Q So the Kronos punches is something</p>	<p>110</p> <p>1 Q And then you point out to him, "In 2 the RFT it states: November 10th, County swipe 3 at 14:27 and punch in at 14:28." Do you see 4 that? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Would there have been a problem if 7 the County swipe was 14:27 and the punch in was 8 14:28? 9 A I would want -- yes. 10 Q What would have been the problem? 11 A It takes more than a minute to get 12 from where the bus swipe would be to the time 13 clock. 14 Q How many minutes does it normally 15 take to your knowledge? 16 A On average, I would -- I mean, I've 17 never rode the bus. But from what I hear from 18 employees, you know, roughly five minutes. 19 Q And so you bring it to his attention 20 that there seemed to be some problem with the 21 November 10th date that was in his list of four 22 dates that were problematic with 23 Mr. Rodriques. Am I correct in that? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Did Mr. De La Torre respond to you</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

33 (Pages 111 to 114)

<p>1 in e-mail, to the best of your remembrance, in 2 regard to these punches?</p> <p>3 A I don't recall.</p> <p>4 Q So in fact, at the stage that</p> <p>5 Mr. De La Torre sent you the RFT file, it was 6 incorrect in regard to that November 10th date?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 (Whereupon a document was identified as 9 Plaintiff's Exhibit 16.)</p> <p>10 Q Exhibit 16 is a memo dated December 11 15th of 2012 from Mr. De La Torre to 12 Mr. Sarsour. Do you see that?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And again we have Mr. De La Torre 15 listing those four dates that were at issue for 16 Mr. Rodriques; correct?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And we know that ultimately that 19 November 10th date was the incorrect actual 20 date; correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And it did get corrected at some 23 later point; right?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And that was before it was sent to</p>	<p>111</p> <p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q But it does have the date changed, 3 and the date was changed from November 10th to 4 November 8th; correct?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And it indicates County swipe at 7 employee lot 14:27. And then above that is 8 14:24 and a few seconds written in. Do you see 9 that?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Do you recall there being an 12 instance by which it was determined that 13 Mr. Rodriques actually swiped the lot at 14:24?</p> <p>14 A I don't recall that specific 15 conversation, no.</p> <p>16 (Whereupon a document was identified as 17 Plaintiff's Exhibit 18.)</p> <p>18 Q Plaintiff's Exhibit 18, I am going 19 to represent to you that this is what Delta has 20 indicated are swipes for Mr. Rodriques in the 21 County lot. And if you could, take a look at 22 the November 8th dates there.</p> <p>23 A Uh-huh (affirmative).</p> <p>24 Q And if you would, see the very first 25 November 8th date says, 14:24 and 11 seconds at</p>
<p>112</p> <p>1 corporate for final approval; correct?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Now, on that November 10th date, it 4 says County swipe at the employee lot 14:27, 5 punch in at 14:28. Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And as you indicated, that would 8 have been a problem because it takes more than 9 a minute to get from the lot over to where the 10 clock would be; correct?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q And you estimated that it would take 13 maybe five minutes to get from the one to the 14 other; correct?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 (Whereupon a document was identified as 17 Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.)</p> <p>18 Q Exhibit 17 is also dated December 19 15th, and it is a memo from Mr. De La Torre to 20 Mr. Sarsour. Do you see that?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And on this particular memo, it 23 looks a little bit different because it 24 actually has Mr. De La Torre's signature on it 25 and it doesn't have a cc line to you; correct?</p>	<p>114</p> <p>1 the bus entry lot. Do you see that?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And so that would be employee lot 4 bus entry. That would be entering into the 5 parking lot; correct?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q So in fact, he did swipe at 14:24 8 and 11; correct?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Now, had you seen these swipes 11 before today?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And so at some point, did you become 14 aware that Mr. Rodriques actually swiped the 15 lot at 14:24?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And then it goes on -- and did you 18 become aware of that before the recommendation 19 for termination package was sent to corporate?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And in spite of that, the 22 correction, the date of November 8th was still 23 left on his list of perceived infractions and 24 sent to corporate?</p> <p>25 A What do you mean?</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

34 (Pages 115 to 118)

<p>1 Q Yeah. You still told corporate that 2 he had inconsistencies on November 8th also; 3 right? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Let's look at the next entry, 6 November 8th, 14:27 and 53 seconds, the door 7 reader. Do you see that there? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Does that indicate or mean that 10 Mr. Rodriques had gone through one of the 11 doors? 12 A Yes. 13 Q At 14:27? 14 A That's correct. 15 Q And that was three minutes and 42 16 seconds after he pulled into the lot? 17 A Yes. 18 Q So that was just about four minutes 19 after he pulled into the lot? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And so what would be wrong if he -- 22 well, let me go to the next one. 23 And then on Exhibit 17, it says he 24 had no punch in; however, a PACE slip for 14:28 25 start was submitted. Do you see that?</p>	<p>115</p> <p>1 fact, he swiped through another door all prior 2 to 14:28. So what was the problem? 3 A I don't know. 4 Q If you could go back, and we're 5 going to work through them a little bit more, 6 Exhibit 16, Mr. De La Torre indicated in the 7 paragraph under the bullet points, "After 8 further investigation, we have come to the 9 conclusion that this is a case of time card 10 fraud." 11 So was Mr. De La Torre in fact 12 recommending Mr. Rodriques's termination 13 because of time card fraud? 14 A Yes. 15 MR. TUYN: You referenced 16 Exhibit 16. Exhibit 17 -- 17 MS. BROCK: I did. 18 MR. TUYN: -- is the same -- 19 MS. BROCK: I know what it says, 20 Counsel. If you have a question you want to 21 ask her, please ask her in your redirect. I am 22 going to get to that document. But I do not 23 want you feeding this witness testimony. 24 MR. TUYN: I'm not feeding 25 testimony. I'm objecting because --</p>
<p>116</p> <p>1 A Uh-huh (affirmative). 2 Q Yes? 3 A Yes. 4 Q So if he walked in the door at 14:27 5 and 53 seconds, what was wrong with him putting 6 14:28, a minute later, as his start time on the 7 PACE sheet? 8 A What was his shift start time? 9 Q I don't know. 10 A Oh. 11 Q I just know that -- 12 A But you're asking me if there's an 13 issue or not. 14 Q No. The issue -- 15 A I would have to know the start time. 16 Q The issue here, my understanding, 17 and maybe you can tell me because I don't want 18 to testify, is not that he was tardy. It was 19 that he falsified the time, that he could not 20 have possibly been at work at 14:28 because he 21 wasn't in the lot. 22 That's what I've been hearing. 23 That's what's written on everything. He wasn't 24 in the lot. He couldn't have possibly been 25 here. But in fact, he was in the lot. And in</p>	<p>118</p> <p>1 MS. BROCK: Well, what's the -- 2 MR. TUYN: -- you are relying on an 3 unsigned document. 4 MS. BROCK: What's the objection 5 under the Rules of Evidence? What is your 6 objection? 7 MR. TUYN: Lack of foundation. 8 MS. BROCK: Then that's fine. We 9 accept your lack of foundation objection. 10 Thank you. 11 Q Exhibit 17. So your testimony is 12 that at this point you're unsure as to what the 13 problem was with the November 8th date; 14 correct? 15 A That's correct. 16 Q Did you at the time that you were 17 working through this recommendation of 18 termination, did it sink in with you that on 19 that date he really had gotten here on that 20 date? 21 A It did not. 22 Q And at some later point, wasn't it 23 brought to your attention -- and it's going to 24 come up a little bit later. Maybe in his 25 appeal I think is where it's going to come up,</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

35 (Pages 119 to 122)

<p>1 and we'll get to it, so I'm not trying to 2 blindside you.</p> <p>3 At some later point, didn't it come 4 to your attention that Mr. Rodriques actually 5 said that Mr. De La Torre said that November 6 8th date would not be included and he had given 7 him a piece of paper and scratched it off. Do 8 you remember that coming up?</p> <p>9 A I remember that being 10 Mr. Rodriques's claim, yes.</p> <p>11 Q And so now does that make a little 12 bit more sense that in fact he was told, don't 13 worry about the November 8th date, that it 14 wouldn't be included because he was actually 15 here on that date and on time? Or at least he 16 was here in time for 14:28. We don't know what 17 time his shift started that day.</p> <p>18 A Can you rephrase that for me.</p> <p>19 Q Sure. Doesn't it make sense that 20 Mr. Rodriques would have said, hey, he told me 21 that that date wouldn't even be considered 22 because, in fact, he was -- he was there on 23 that date?</p> <p>24 A Well, I can't speak to that. I 25 wasn't in the conversation.</p>	<p>119</p> <p>1 has fraudulently submitted his time records." 2 Do you see that? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Where on Exhibit 16, he had 5 indicated that Mr. Rodriques had committed time 6 card fraud; correct? 7 A Yes. 8 Q Did you instruct Mr. De La Torre to 9 change his phrasing to fraudulently submitted 10 his time records? 11 A I don't recall that specific 12 conversation. I frequently change or make 13 recommendations for change on these. 14 Q But you don't recall? 15 A No. 16 Q Do you recall whether anyone else 17 told Mr. De La Torre to change the use of his 18 language? 19 A No, I do not. 20 (Whereupon a document was identified as 21 Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.) 22 Q Ms. Franz, you've been handed what 23 has been marked as Exhibit 19. 24 A Yes. 25 Q And it is an e-mail dated December</p>
<p>120</p> <p>1 Q Right. 2 A So. 3 Q But you can speak to whether it 4 makes sense or not that that's what occurred. 5 Did it make sense that, yeah, he said that this 6 date wouldn't even be considered? 7 A It makes sense that, based on these 8 dates, it appears as though he was there. I 9 can't draw the conclusion that it makes sense 10 that Domingo said what he said because I wasn't 11 there. 12 Q Do you recall reading in the 13 recommendation for termination file where 14 Mr. De La Torre indicated, and you quoted it to 15 corporate on an occasion or two, and I think 16 we'll get to it, that Mr. Rodriques said that 17 the November 6 date was some sort of oversight 18 and had mentioned that he was voting on that 19 day. Do you remember that? 20 A I remember that. I don't recall 21 when it occurred in the chain of events. 22 Q Now, Mr. De La Torre also made other 23 changes from Exhibit 16 to Exhibit 17. He 24 changed the description of what Mr. Rodriques 25 did to, "We have determined that Mr. Rodriques</p>	<p>121</p> <p>18th of 2012. And it is from you to Tyesha 2 Gray. Do you see that? 3 A Yes. 4 Q And you indicate in the e-mail to -- 5 and Ms. Gray is your direct report; correct? 6 She's your boss. She was your boss at the 7 time? 8 A Yes. 9 Q And you included Mr. Rodriques's RFT 10 HR - Time card.doc. Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh (affirmative). 12 Q Yes? 13 A Yes. 14 Q And Mr. Rodriques's RFT OPS -- 15 operations? 16 A Yes. 17 Q --- Time Card.doc; correct? 18 A Yes. 19 Q And in the body of the e-mail, you 20 tell Ms. Tyesha that this termination is for 21 time card fraud; correct? 22 A Yes. 23 Q So in fact, Mr. Rodriques was 24 terminated for time card fraud? 25 A Yes.</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

36 (Pages 123 to 126)

<p>1 (Whereupon a document was identified as 2 Plaintiff's Exhibit 20.) 3 Q Exhibit 20 is an e-mail dated 4 December 21st from you to Mr. Sarsour. Do you 5 see that? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Now, the content of this e-mail is 8 blank. It has an attachment, but the actual 9 content is blank. Do you know why this e-mail 10 is blank? 11 A No. 12 Q Was it typical for you to send 13 Mr. Sarsour an e-mail with no content? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Why? 16 A We might have been on the phone. It 17 could be a variety of reasons. He may have 18 asked me in person for a copy of it. A wide 19 variety of reasons why I would send an e-mail 20 without -- he knows why it's coming. 21 (Whereupon a document was identified as 22 Plaintiff's Exhibit 21.) 23 Q Plaintiff's Exhibit 21 is an e-mail 24 dated January 9th of 2013, and it's from Lisa 25 Ali to Mr. De La Torre and Mr. Sarsour with you</p>	<p>123</p> <p>1 attest to that. 2 Q Do you know who informed him of his 3 termination? 4 A I don't recall. 5 (Whereupon a document was identified as 6 Plaintiff's Exhibit 22.) 7 Q Exhibit 22, an e-mail from you to 8 Mr. Kriksciun, and it's dated January 9th of 9 2013. And you say, "Here is the one for 10 Rodriques." What did you mean by, "Here is the 11 one"? Were you sending him multiple 12 recommendations for termination, or do you 13 remember what was going on? 14 A I don't recall. 15 (Whereupon a document was identified as 16 Plaintiff's Exhibit 23.) 17 Q Exhibit 23, it is an e-mail from you 18 to Lisa Ali dated January 10th of 2013; 19 correct? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And so this e-mail is you notifying 22 corporate that Mr. Rodriques was told about the 23 termination; correct? 24 A Yes. 25 Q And you indicated that you're not</p>
<p>124</p> <p>1 cc'd as well as Ms. Gray. Do you see that? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Who is Lisa Ali? 4 A She was the ACS -- I think her title 5 was coordinator. 6 Q And what does ACS stand for? 7 A Airport customer service. 8 Q And is she located here in Atlanta? 9 A She was. 10 Q Or was she? 11 A Yes. 12 Q Is she still located in Atlanta? 13 A No. 14 Q Is she still an employee of Delta to 15 the best of your knowledge? 16 A No, she's not. 17 Q And Ms. Ali instructed 18 Mr. De La Torre and Mr. Sarsour and yourself 19 and Ms. Gray via cc to inform Mr. Rodriques 20 that he could appeal the termination decision; 21 correct? 22 A Yes. 23 Q And was Mr. Rodriques informed that 24 he could appeal the termination decision? 25 A I wasn't on that call, so I can't</p>	<p>124</p> <p>126</p> <p>1 the one who actually told him; right? 2 A I don't think I indicated that, but 3 I was not. 4 Q Oh, because you told me you weren't 5 sure who told him and -- 6 A Okay. 7 Q -- who -- you're not getting ready 8 to drive me crazy. I'm doing the best I can. 9 So you didn't tell him, and you don't recall 10 who told him? 11 A That's correct. 12 (Whereupon a document was identified as 13 Plaintiff's Exhibit 24.) 14 Q Exhibit 24 is an e-mail from you to 15 Ms. Kelley Nabors regarding an appeal for 16 Jerrick Rodriques. Who is Kelley Nabors? 17 A Kelley Nabors is part of our equal 18 opportunity department. 19 Q Does the equal opportunity 20 department investigate the appeals of 21 terminations? Is that part of their duties? 22 A Yes. 23 Q Going to the second page, the 24 earlier of the e-mails, the April 1st e-mail 25 between you and Ms. Nabors, she mentioned to</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

37 (Pages 127 to 130)

127	129
<p>1 you -- here's where you were told that 2 Mr. Rodriques said that he was told the 3 November 8th date would not be included and 4 that Mr. De La Torre had scratched off that 5 date and given him the slip; correct?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And she asked you to follow up with 8 Mr. De La Torre and with Carla Bell; correct?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Who is Carla Bell?</p> <p>11 A She's a performance leader or was.</p> <p>12 Q Is she still an employee of Delta?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q What is her current position?</p> <p>15 A I don't know. She's not a 16 performance leader anymore. I'm not sure what 17 her actual title is.</p> <p>18 Q Did she go up or down?</p> <p>19 A I don't know. She took a corporate 20 position, so I don't know if it was up, down, 21 or sideways.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Is she out here now?</p> <p>23 A I don't know where she's physically 24 located.</p> <p>25 Q Now, I understand that Ms. Bell was</p>	<p>1 that you spoke with Mr. De La Torre and that he 2 doesn't have any recollection of any of that; 3 correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Also in this e-mail is where you 6 indicate that this conversation between 7 Mr. De La Torre and Mr. Rodriques should have 8 been placed in Mr. Rodriques's journal. But 9 based on her question, it looks like it might 10 not be there; correct?</p> <p>11 A Correct.</p> <p>12 Q Did you ever pull his journal to see 13 if it was there?</p> <p>14 A I wouldn't have had the journal at 15 this point. It would have gone with the file.</p> <p>16 Q And do you recall seeing this 17 conversation in the journal?</p> <p>18 A I don't recall.</p> <p>19 Q And you re-quote -- well, let me ask 20 it. The paragraph that starts with, "During 21 the interview, I questioned," is that a cut and 22 paste of Mr. De La Torre's e-mail to you at 23 some earlier point?</p> <p>24 A According to this e-mail, yeah. It 25 says it was a e-mail I received from him the</p>
128	130
<p>1 on medical during this time. Did you ever 2 confer with Ms. Bell after she returned from 3 medical as to this scratching off of that 4 8th date and this slip of paper?</p> <p>5 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>6 Q And Mr. De La Torre, according to 7 your e-mail, said that he didn't have any 8 recollection of telling him that that date 9 wouldn't count and scratching off and giving 10 any papers; correct?</p> <p>11 A That's not in this e-mail.</p> <p>12 Q All right. Give me a second. I'll 13 have it for you. But you did follow up with 14 Mr. De La Torre?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q And he did in fact tell you that he 17 didn't remember giving him anything; correct?</p> <p>18 A That's -- yes, that's my -- yes. 19 (Whereupon a document was identified as 20 Plaintiff's Exhibit 25.)</p> <p>21 Q I have the e-mail. I do actually 22 have it. Exhibit 25, Ms. Franz, is the e-mail.</p> <p>23 A Thank you.</p> <p>24 Q You're welcome. It's dated April 25 8th of 2013, and it's where you tell Ms. Nabors</p>	<p>1 day of suspension.</p> <p>2 Q Yeah. I just didn't -- I want to 3 ask you about it, but I didn't want to make the 4 leap that this was not you talking because it 5 doesn't have quotation marks.</p> <p>6 A Oh, yeah. No.</p> <p>7 Q So I just wanted you to say that.</p> <p>8 A Okay.</p> <p>9 Q I knew it wasn't, but I needed you 10 to say it.</p> <p>11 A Okay.</p> <p>12 Q And you were letting Ms. Nabors know 13 that Mr. De La Torre says he admitted to 14 turning in the slip on the 5th for a start time 15 of 14:28; correct?</p> <p>16 A Correct.</p> <p>17 Q But in reality, he wasn't on the 18 premises until 16:19. And he said it was some 19 sort of oversight; correct?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Did you know at that point that this 22 oversight that occurred on that day had 23 anything to do with him being voting -- voting 24 on that day, that it was Election Day?</p> <p>25 A At what point?</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

38 (Pages 131 to 134)

<p>1 Q At this point, did you know?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q At some later point, did you come to</p> <p>4 know that Mr. Rodriques was saying, I was out</p> <p>5 voting that day, and there was -- this is just</p> <p>6 a mistake?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q When did you become aware of that?</p> <p>9 A I don't recall timing.</p> <p>10 Q Was it before or after you</p> <p>11 recommended his termination?</p> <p>12 A After.</p> <p>13 Q How did you become aware?</p> <p>14 A I don't -- I don't recall. I just</p> <p>15 remember that conversation.</p> <p>16 Q Were you aware that Mr. Rodriques</p> <p>17 had notified his PL, Mr. Ortiz, that he was</p> <p>18 running late that day?</p> <p>19 A That was the conversation.</p> <p>20 Q When you say, "that was the</p> <p>21 conversation," what are you meaning? Is that</p> <p>22 the conversation you're recalling where you</p> <p>23 found out that he was saying he was voting?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And you found out in the context of</p>	<p>131</p> <p>1 Q And if Mr. Ortiz, and this is -- in</p> <p>2 all fairness, I don't have testimony to this.</p> <p>3 I'm not trying to tell you that this occurred.</p> <p>4 I just have a question based on what happened</p> <p>5 with Mr. Culpepper.</p> <p>6 If Mr. Ortiz can say that he gave</p> <p>7 Mr. Rodriques permission to sign in at 14:28 on</p> <p>8 that day, would this now not be time card</p> <p>9 fraud? And if the question doesn't make sense,</p> <p>10 let me take you back to your testimony.</p> <p>11 You testified that, because</p> <p>12 Mr. Culpepper gave Mr. Conover permission to</p> <p>13 stay punched in on the clock and to go over and</p> <p>14 do whatever Mr. Conover was doing that day,</p> <p>15 that that would not be time card fraud because</p> <p>16 he had permission from his PL to do so.</p> <p>17 A Uh-huh (affirmative).</p> <p>18 Q So my -- yes? Yes?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q So my question to you is: If</p> <p>21 Mr. Ortiz gave Mr. Rodriques that same kind of</p> <p>22 permission, November 6 would not have been</p> <p>23 considered time card fraud; correct?</p> <p>24 MR. TUYN: Just a foundational</p> <p>25 objection. It's not what the evidence is in</p>
<p>132</p> <p>1 him -- someone saying, I know right now --</p> <p>2 A Yeah.</p> <p>3 Q -- you're not able to remember who,</p> <p>4 but someone saying he called in to Mr. Ortiz</p> <p>5 and told him that he was voting. He was</p> <p>6 running late because he was voting.</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Did you ever speak to Mr. Ortiz</p> <p>9 about Mr. Rodriques's claim that he had been</p> <p>10 texting him that day, letting him know he was</p> <p>11 going to be late, that this wasn't a secret,</p> <p>12 that he had been telling his PL that he was</p> <p>13 going to be late that day?</p> <p>14 A I did talk to Mr. Ortiz, yes.</p> <p>15 Q Did Mr. Ortiz confirm that</p> <p>16 Mr. Rodriques had been telling him that he was</p> <p>17 going to be late that day?</p> <p>18 A He remembered the conversation, yes.</p> <p>19 I didn't get the specifics of what that</p> <p>20 conversation was.</p> <p>21 Q Did he indicate that he had approved</p> <p>22 Mr. Rodriques to be late that day because he</p> <p>23 was out voting?</p> <p>24 A I don't know that he said approved.</p> <p>25 He said he was aware.</p>	<p>134</p> <p>1 the case.</p> <p>2 MS. BROCK: Okay. That's not what</p> <p>3 your interpretation of the evidence is, but I'm</p> <p>4 not representing that to her. That's for</p> <p>5 argument's sake.</p> <p>6 MR. TUYN: The way you phrased it</p> <p>7 was that he gave him permission to put --</p> <p>8 MS. BROCK: I asked the question.</p> <p>9 MR. TUYN: -- 14:28 down on his time</p> <p>10 card.</p> <p>11 MS. BROCK: I asked the question,</p> <p>12 and I said to her I'm not representing anything</p> <p>13 as fact to her before I even started the</p> <p>14 question. But go ahead. Because that's going</p> <p>15 to be my argument, and I don't want to put that</p> <p>16 on you.</p> <p>17 MR. TUYN: All right. Well,</p> <p>18 official objection --</p> <p>19 Q So my question is --</p> <p>20 MR. TUYN: -- that you're asking the</p> <p>21 witness to speculate.</p> <p>22 MS. BROCK: Okay. Now that's a good</p> <p>23 one.</p> <p>24 Q So my question to you is, is that,</p> <p>25 if Mr. Ortiz actually gave Mr. Rodriques</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

39 (Pages 135 to 138)

<p>1 permission to put 14:28 on his time card even 2 though he didn't get here until 16:19, would 3 that still be time card fraud?</p> <p>4 A I'm just thinking through.</p> <p>5 Q Please.</p> <p>6 A So you're stating that he, 7 Mr. Ortiz, said, I know you weren't here, put 8 the 14:28 on your time card, and I'll pay you 9 for the time that you were voting.</p> <p>10 Q Only --</p> <p>11 A Then yes, I would say that would not 12 have been time card fraud.</p> <p>13 Q And I'm only willing to go that far 14 if you're saying Mr. Culpepper told 15 Mr. Conover, you can stay punched in and get 16 paid even though you're going to go somewhere 17 else.</p> <p>18 MR. TUYN: Well, and that's not in 19 evidence either. So lack of foundation to 20 that.</p> <p>21 MS. BROCK: She testified that her 22 understanding was that Mr. Culpepper gave him 23 permission. I don't want to say to go sleep 24 because she didn't say to go sleep, so I said 25 to go somewhere else because I didn't want to</p>	<p>135</p> <p>1 So if Mr. Ortiz gave Mr. Rodriques 2 permission to put 14:28 on his time card, would 3 that now not be time card fraud?</p> <p>4 A He had authorization from his PL.</p> <p>5 No.</p> <p>6 Q If you could, turn back to 7 Exhibit 17. It's really 16 and 17. But for 8 Attorney Tuyn's consideration, we'll focus on 9 Exhibit 17. Mr. De La Torre indicated that 10 during the investigation of Mr. Rodriques's 11 payroll records, multiple time discrepancies, 12 none of which he has been able to explain. You 13 see that there?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q Didn't Mr. Rodriques in fact explain 16 one of his -- at least one, because we don't 17 know the conversation as to the 8th, the 18 November 8th date. But as for the November 6th 19 date, didn't he explain that that was some sort 20 of oversight? I'm not even talking about going 21 into the election stuff.</p> <p>22 A He said it could have been an 23 oversight.</p> <p>24 Q So that is an explanation; correct?</p> <p>25 I mean, Mr. De La Torre may not have believed</p>
<p>136</p> <p>1 put that word in your mouth.</p> <p>2 But that was her testimony, that 3 Mr. Culpepper gave him permission and that 4 that's why it was not time card fraud. I just 5 asked the very same thing in regard to 6 Mr. Rodriques.</p> <p>7 Q If his PL, Mr. Ortiz, gave him 8 permission, would it not be time card fraud?</p> <p>9 A Gave him permission to be paid for 10 voting and --</p> <p>11 Q Paid. Paid, period.</p> <p>12 A -- and gave that authorization --</p> <p>13 Q Paid, period.</p> <p>14 A I'm --</p> <p>15 MR. TUYN: That wasn't what the 16 question was. The question was gave him 17 permission to put 14:28 down on a time card.</p> <p>18 Q I like that question better, so 19 let's stick with it, to put 14:28 on his time 20 card.</p> <p>21 A I'm not sure I understand the 22 question.</p> <p>23 Q Yeah. I like his question much 24 better than mine. His is way better than 25 mine.</p>	<p>138</p> <p>1 it, but it was an explanation; correct?</p> <p>2 A I'm not sure that I would consider 3 that an explanation. It could have been an 4 oversight on his part. I mean, that's what 5 he's stating, but I don't know that I would 6 consider that an explanation.</p> <p>7 Q But at some point, an actual 8 explanation was proffered, correct, or given, 9 correct, as far as him voting, him talking to 10 Ortiz? Some explanation for the November 6 11 date was given at some later point; correct?</p> <p>12 A I recall that. I don't remember 13 when that was.</p> <p>14 Q But you don't know when it was?</p> <p>15 A Right.</p> <p>16 Q But you know at some later point an 17 explanation was actually provided for that?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 MR. TUYN: Are we at a point where 20 we can take a break?</p> <p>21 MS. BROCK: Yeah. Now's fine. 22 (Proceedings in recess, 12:22 p.m to 23 12:37 p.m.) 24 (Whereupon a document was identified as 25 Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.)</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

40 (Pages 139 to 142)

<p>1 Q Ms. Franz, you have been handed what 2 has been marked as Exhibit 26, and it is a 3 document that the first block on it is dated 4 January 28th of 2013. And it says, "Received 5 appeal." Do you see that there?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Have you ever seen this document 8 before today?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Did you see it before yesterday?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q And you did not draft this document 13 then; correct?</p> <p>14 A No, I did not.</p> <p>15 Q If you could turn to the second 16 page, and approximately in the middle of the 17 page there's a small paragraph, a one-sentence 18 paragraph that says, "Jerrick also said that 19 Domingo told him not to worry about the 20 November 8th, 2012, date. And he scratched off 21 the date and gave the slip to Jerrick to keep." 22 Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Who provided this information to 25 Ms. Nabors?</p>	<p>139</p> <p>1 so, but.</p> <p>2 Q Oh, okay. And then she also says in 3 italics a little bit further down, "I received 4 an investigation summary from HR that explains 5 the difference between all of the employees and 6 why two employees were not terminated and the 7 action they were placed on. The two who were 8 not terminated had different circumstances than 9 those who were terminated." Do you see that 10 there?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Did you provide her with the 13 investigation summary?</p> <p>14 A I don't recall doing that, but I 15 very well could have.</p> <p>16 Q Was there someone else under your 17 supervision that Ms. Nabors would have been in 18 touch with during an appeal investigation?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q So when she says HR, in essence 21 she's saying Ms. Franz. Am I correct?</p> <p>22 A Yes. I think that's a fair 23 assumption.</p> <p>24 Q So at least in her notes, she's 25 saying it was you that sent her the</p>
<p>140</p> <p>1 A I don't know.</p> <p>2 Q And I do know that there was an 3 e-mail that we talked about a little bit 4 earlier where you told Ms. Nabors on April 8th 5 of 2013 that Mr. De La Torre didn't remember 6 anything about scratching anything off. But 7 you don't know who actually informed her in the 8 first place.</p> <p>9 You don't have personal knowledge. 10 I think she tells us, but you don't have 11 personal knowledge of who told her that?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 MR. TUYN: Well, the document itself 14 is talking about a conversation that EO had 15 with Jerrick Rodriques.</p> <p>16 MS. BROCK: I get it. I just wanted 17 to know if she had any personal knowledge about 18 it.</p> <p>19 Q And then she puts in parentheses, 20 "follow up on this comment has been requested 21 from HR." And that's referring to the e-mail 22 that she sent you asking you to talk to Carla 23 Bell and to Mr. De La Torre. Am I correct in 24 that?</p> <p>25 A I didn't write that. I would assume</p>	<p>142</p> <p>1 investigation summary for Conover and 2 Culpepper; correct?</p> <p>3 A No. It doesn't say who.</p> <p>4 Q Well, it just says why the two 5 employees were not terminated. I don't know of 6 any other two. Do you know of any other two 7 that were not terminated?</p> <p>8 A Are there two -- there's lots of 9 employees who were not terminated.</p> <p>10 Q Of the two employees that were not 11 terminated in regard -- oh, the paragraph above 12 says Chris Culpepper and Jason Conover. So as 13 to those two individuals, did you send the 14 investigation summary from HR? Did you send 15 her an -- well, do you recall sending her an 16 investigation summary?</p> <p>17 A I don't recall specifically doing 18 that.</p> <p>19 Q Do you recall informing her that the 20 two who were not terminated had different 21 circumstances?</p> <p>22 A I remember having that conversation, 23 yes.</p> <p>24 Q And what about their circumstances 25 were different from Mr. Rodriques?</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

41 (Pages 143 to 146)

<p style="text-align: right;">143</p> <p>1 A With Chris Culpepper and Jason 2 Conover, I think the two differentiating 3 factors were that Mr. Culpepper provided 4 Mr. Conover the authorization as well as the 5 fact that it was a one-time incident, if I 6 recall correctly.</p> <p>7 Q But you don't remember seeing any of 8 Mr. Conover or Mr. Culpepper's swipes or Kronos 9 punches, do you, County swipes or Kronos 10 punches?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q So how do you know it was a one-time 13 incident with the two of them?</p> <p>14 A Based on the investigation that was 15 conducted by the leader.</p> <p>16 Q So not an investigation you looked 17 into or conducted; correct?</p> <p>18 A Correct.</p> <p>19 Q Based on what someone else told 20 you --</p> <p>21 A It was a one --</p> <p>22 Q -- this was a one-time thing?</p> <p>23 A Correct.</p> <p>24 Q Do you know whether they looked at 25 Mr. Culpepper's or Mr. Conover's punches and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">145</p> <p>1 requested those swipes from the County; 2 correct?</p> <p>3 A They wouldn't have been able to do 4 it. It would have probably been the attendance 5 coordinator who would have done so, yes.</p> <p>6 Q And she can't do it either. She has 7 to go to the person who has that authority to 8 be able to actually e-mail over to Wayne 9 County; correct?</p> <p>10 A Okay. Yeah.</p> <p>11 Q So through the chain, they did 12 request some swipes, because I'm -- I'm still 13 working with Wayne County to get these swipes. 14 And so you're saying that you know somebody 15 told you, you don't know who at Delta, that 16 they looked at the swipes from Mr. Conover and 17 Mr. Culpepper during this period of time?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And after comparing those swipes to 20 the Kronos time clocks, they said that there 21 was no other incident other than this one 22 incident that we're talking about in November 23 2012?</p> <p>24 A Correct.</p> <p>25 Q So you gave me two reasons that the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">144</p> <p>1 swipes?</p> <p>2 A They did, yes.</p> <p>3 Q When I say "punches," I mean Kronos. 4 When I say "swipes," I mean County swipes.</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q How do you know that?</p> <p>7 A They told me that.</p> <p>8 Q Yeah. But they didn't tell you that 9 they docked their pay, so you're saying that 10 you believe what they told you?</p> <p>11 A Absolutely.</p> <p>12 Q So they told you -- and which is the 13 "they"? Who actually said they looked at them?</p> <p>14 A I don't recall specifically, but I 15 believe it was in the e-mail communication.</p> <p>16 Q I don't have any e-mails regarding 17 Conover and Culpepper, so.</p> <p>18 A Oh, okay. I don't recall where that 19 took place, but I do remember asking that 20 question.</p> <p>21 Q Somebody, but you don't know who, 22 told you that they looked at Conover's and 23 Culpepper's punches and swipes?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And they would have had to have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">146</p> <p>1 situation was different. One was because 2 Culpepper actually gave Conover permission; 3 correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q If Culpepper gave Conover 6 permission, why did they dock his pay, 7 Conover's pay?</p> <p>8 A I can't speak to that. I didn't 9 make that decision.</p> <p>10 Q And as far as the situation with 11 Mr. Culpepper and Mr. Culpepper not working for 12 part of his shift, what happened with 13 Mr. Culpepper, do you still consider that to be 14 different?</p> <p>15 I know you didn't know at the time. 16 But do you still consider that as being 17 different from what happened with 18 Mr. Rodriques?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And how so?</p> <p>21 A It was one day.</p> <p>22 Q So it was okay that he punched in, 23 did not work, was docked for that pay because 24 he only did it once?</p> <p>25 A I didn't say it was okay. I said it</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

42 (Pages 147 to 150)

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

43 (Pages 151 to 154)

<p>1 page because we're really going to flip.</p> <p>2 A Okay.</p> <p>3 Q But I just wanted to take you where</p> <p>4 we started. April 15th, 2013. It says, "Hey,</p> <p>5 Barb. Can you tell me if there has been an</p> <p>6 incident with Lance Dowdell this year that</p> <p>7 would seemingly be WPV?" What does WPV stand</p> <p>8 for?</p> <p>9 A Workplace violence.</p> <p>10 Q Was there an incident with a Lance</p> <p>11 Dowdell?</p> <p>12 A I don't recall that name.</p> <p>13 Q Did you ever respond to Ms. Nabors?</p> <p>14 I don't see a response from you in her chain of</p> <p>15 stuff that was occurring.</p> <p>16 A I don't recall that.</p> <p>17 Q You don't recall whether you</p> <p>18 responded to her?</p> <p>19 A Yeah. No, I don't. That name is</p> <p>20 familiar, but I don't recall the specifics.</p> <p>21 MS. BROCK: Again, Counsel, and I'm</p> <p>22 not being difficult, but if when you look for</p> <p>23 the Conover-Culpepper information, if you could</p> <p>24 check the electronic data at Delta to see about</p> <p>25 a response to Ms. Nabors' inquiry here as to</p>	<p>151</p> <p>1 and Tyesha Gray. And you indicate that you</p> <p>2 have two compliance call, anonymous, on this</p> <p>3 issue and that you're collecting data. Do you</p> <p>4 see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And that was in response -- let me</p> <p>7 back up because these e-mails start from the</p> <p>8 bottom up. This was in response to a January</p> <p>9 9th inquiry by Ms. LeeAustin to Ms. Gray and</p> <p>10 you being cc'd saying that she had received a</p> <p>11 call from Mr. Rodriques. And he mentioned the</p> <p>12 two non-minority employees and what had</p> <p>13 happened with them; correct?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q So Mr. Rodriques had made the</p> <p>16 company aware himself directly to</p> <p>17 Ms. LeeAustin that he felt that the two white</p> <p>18 employees were treated differently. He wants</p> <p>19 to understand why he's being treated</p> <p>20 differently than his non-minority peers.</p> <p>21 So he made the company aware that he</p> <p>22 felt that the two white employees were being</p> <p>23 treated differently; correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q You then provide somewhat of a</p>
<p>152</p> <p>1 Mr. Dowdell in that Mr. Rodriques included him</p> <p>2 in his appeal.</p> <p>3 Q Were you able to confirm or deny</p> <p>4 that there was a comment from those at the</p> <p>5 Detroit location that they were keeping the</p> <p>6 Lance Dowdell situation "away from ATL because</p> <p>7 they don't want the top dogs asking what the</p> <p>8 hell you are doing"?</p> <p>9 A I don't recall that.</p> <p>10 Q Were you able to confirm it or not?</p> <p>11 A I don't remember this e-mail at all.</p> <p>12 Q What race was Lance Dowdell?</p> <p>13 A I don't know.</p> <p>14 Q Now, we do know based on further</p> <p>15 down, April 8th, 2013, that effective March 4th</p> <p>16 of 2013 Lance Dowdell no longer works at Delta.</p> <p>17 Do we see that?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And you, sitting here today, can't</p> <p>20 recall why Mr. Dowdell is no longer employed?</p> <p>21 A I cannot.</p> <p>22 (Whereupon a document was identified as</p> <p>23 Plaintiff's Exhibit 27.)</p> <p>24 Q Exhibit 27. Ms. Franz, Exhibit 27</p> <p>25 is an e-mail from you to Cassandra LeeAustin</p>	<p>154</p> <p>1 statement in regard to what happened with</p> <p>2 Mr. Culpepper and Mr. Conover in that paragraph</p> <p>3 that starts, "These other two employees he</p> <p>4 mentions had a completely different issue." Do</p> <p>5 you see that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And when you gave that explanation,</p> <p>8 you only make mention of the Culpepper removing</p> <p>9 Conover from the RTS line; correct?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And that's because you didn't know</p> <p>12 about him, Culpepper, being punched in and away</p> <p>13 from his work station or not working?</p> <p>14 A Correct.</p> <p>15 Q Had you known, you certainly would</p> <p>16 have told them; correct?</p> <p>17 A Told --</p> <p>18 Q Yeah.</p> <p>19 A -- Cassandra and Tyesha?</p> <p>20 Q Yeah.</p> <p>21 A Oh, absolutely.</p> <p>22 Q Yeah. Who is Ms. Cassandra</p> <p>23 LeeAustin?</p> <p>24 A She is or was a general manager in</p> <p>25 HR.</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

44 (Pages 155 to 158)

<p>1 Q Would she have worked here in 2 Atlanta -- 3 A Yes. 4 Q -- at that time? Is she still an 5 employee of Delta? 6 A Yes. 7 Q And where is she now? 8 A Still here in Atlanta. 9 Q But she's not a general manager 10 anymore? 11 A She is, just in a different area. 12 Q To the best of your knowledge, did 13 anyone from corporate -- and when I say 14 "anyone," I mean Ms. Nabors, Ms. Gray, 15 Ms. LeeAustin -- conduct an independent 16 investigation into Mr. Rodriques's claims of 17 unfair treatment? 18 A Not to my knowledge. 19 Q So the information that those 20 individuals had was the information you 21 provided them to the best of your knowledge? 22 A Correct. 23 Q And you didn't have all of the 24 information yourself; correct? 25 A What do you mean?</p>	<p>155</p> <p>1 A Yes. 2 Q Did you conduct the ethics hot line 3 investigation into complaints of race 4 discrimination that involved Jerrick Rodriques? 5 A No. 6 Q Who conducted the investigation? 7 A Related to this complaint? 8 Q Yes. 9 A Well, it has a few components, so it 10 was based upon the previous investigations that 11 were conducted. 12 Q When you say "the previous 13 investigations," are you talking about 14 Mr. Kotula's investigation? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Mr. De La Torre's investigation? 17 A Yes. 18 Q You didn't conduct a separate 19 investigation, did you? 20 A No. 21 Q So it would have been those two 22 investigations. The information you provided 23 in response to the appeal request -- 24 A Yes. 25 Q -- are you considering that an</p>
<p>156</p> <p>1 Q Yeah. You didn't know about the 2 docking of the pay. You didn't know about -- 3 of both of them being docked. You didn't know 4 about Culpepper being away from his work 5 station and being docked because of it. You 6 didn't know the whole story yourself, did you? 7 A No. 8 Q You told Ms. Gray to feel free to 9 call you if she wanted to discuss it further. 10 Do you recall whether she contacted you about 11 that? 12 A I don't recall. 13 (Whereupon a document was identified as 14 Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.) 15 Q These should go relatively quick 16 because they look pretty much the same, so that 17 should be a word of encouragement for you. 18 This is Exhibit 28, and it is an Ethics and 19 Compliance Reporting form. Do you see that? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And it is for a report number ending 22 in 311. Do you also see that? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Have you seen this document before 25 yesterday?</p>	<p>158</p> <p>1 investigation? 2 A No. I said I didn't conduct the 3 investigation, so no. 4 Q So when you say that it was based on 5 the investigation, it was based on information 6 Mr. Kotula and Mr. De La Torre provided? 7 A Yes. 8 Q And so as far as you know, did 9 anyone from corporate call and speak to anyone 10 at Detroit about this situation, like witnesses 11 to talk to people, to interview people, as far 12 as you know? 13 A At the point that this was received? 14 Q Well, in response to it. Because 15 you said there's a few components to the 16 investigation of it. 17 A No. I said there were a few 18 components that we got information from. There 19 were a few investigations that took place. 20 Q Maybe it will help me if you tell me 21 what investigations took place, because you 22 said there were a few investigations that took 23 place. 24 A So this is referring to Chris 25 Culpepper and claiming that his was time clock</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

45 (Pages 159 to 162)

<p>1 fraud, so that would have been -- I believe 2 Mr. Sarsour was involved in that investigation. 3 And then -- oh, sorry. Go ahead. 4 Q No, no, no. 5 MR. TUYN: Well, no. I don't think 6 you're done with your answer. 7 Q No, no. I do want you to answer. 8 A Okay. So then it says Jerrick 9 Rodrigues was suspended because he punched the 10 wrong number of hours and hasn't come back to 11 work. So that would have been De La Torre. 12 And then it says Fadi Beydoun was 13 suspended for punching himself in and then 14 going through the employee lot. I don't recall 15 who conducted that investigation. 16 And then it claims that I was 17 contacted, but I was never contacted by 18 Mr. Rodrigues. So that's why I mean there are 19 several parts to that. 20 Q So Mr. Rodrigues never contacted you 21 to find out when he would be coming back to 22 work? 23 A Not that I recall, no. 24 Q He never contacted you to ask him 25 why he had been suspended for such a long time?</p>	<p>159</p> <p>1 one. Tell me what it looks like. Is it an 2 automatic from the third party? Is it -- tell 3 me what that looks like. 4 A The original e-mail would be 5 automated, and then I would receive it from 6 Lisa Ali. Or would have received it from Lisa 7 Ali, I should say. 8 Q So Ms. Ali in her former position as 9 general manager? 10 A Huh-uh (negative). 11 Q Am I wrong about that? 12 A Coordinator. 13 Q The general manager was the other 14 person we just got finished talking about, 15 Ms. LeeAustin? 16 A Yes. 17 Q And so Ms. Ali, she was in the EO 18 department? 19 A No. She's in ACS. 20 Q And she's who would have forwarded 21 you the actual report that came in? 22 A Yes. 23 Q And in her forwarding you the 24 report, and again, I think I may have this 25 e-mail, she would have said to you, look into</p>
<p>160</p> <p>1 A Huh-uh (negative), not that I 2 recall. 3 Q Would anyone other than you have 4 responded to this, responded to corporate 5 regarding this 311 report? 6 A No. 7 Q And I think you said it already. 8 But as far as you know, no one from corporate 9 conducted an investigation outside of you into 10 311 at metro? 11 A Not that I'm aware of. 12 Q Did anyone from corporate ever send 13 you any communication saying, hey, we talked to 14 people down there, and did you know this? 15 A No. 16 Q Now, you said you had seen this 17 before yesterday. Did you receive this at the 18 time that you were asked to look into it? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Who asked you to look into it? 21 A Well, it comes in e-mail, and it's a 22 given to look into it. So I don't think anyone 23 specifically told me. 24 Q The e-mail that it comes in, tell me 25 about that e-mail. I may actually have that</p>	<p>161</p> <p>162</p> <p>1 this and let us know what's going on? 2 A I don't know that she would have 3 said anything. It might have just been a 4 forward, or it might have said, for your 5 investigation. I don't know. Sometimes it 6 says different things. But she would have just 7 forwarded it to me, and I'd know what to do 8 with it. 9 Q So when you received this report 10 311, it indicates that Mr. Domingo is the 11 person that is being accused, correct, because 12 it says who. So it indicates that Mr. Domingo 13 is who was being accused; correct? 14 A I don't see that. 15 Q Under Who, it says, "Caller, name 16 declined, reported Unknown Domingo"? 17 A Oh, yes. I see that. Thank you. 18 Q Oh, you're welcome. I don't mind. 19 And you understood that Domingo to be Domingo 20 De La Torre; correct? 21 A Yes. 22 Q When you received this report, did 23 you look into the reason why Mr. Rodrigues's 24 suspension was for such a long period of time? 25 A I did not look into it, no. I was</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

46 (Pages 163 to 166)

<p>1 aware.</p> <p>2 Q Why was it such a long period of</p> <p>3 time?</p> <p>4 A Part of the reason was the review</p> <p>5 process. The other part was, unfortunately,</p> <p>6 his suspension was over the holidays, and we</p> <p>7 have a practice of not communicating</p> <p>8 terminations during that period.</p> <p>9 Q What is that period? When you say</p> <p>10 "that period," from when to when?</p> <p>11 A It's a little different every year,</p> <p>12 so I don't know when it was at this point. But</p> <p>13 typically it's the week before Christmas</p> <p>14 through New Year's.</p> <p>15 Q And so you would have been aware</p> <p>16 based on the statements of the caller, and I</p> <p>17 think this one may have actually been</p> <p>18 Mr. Rodriques, I don't have the number with me,</p> <p>19 but I think this one was him, that based on the</p> <p>20 anonymous call, that obvious discriminatory</p> <p>21 practices -- the person felt that there were</p> <p>22 obvious discriminatory practices happening in</p> <p>23 Detroit.</p> <p>24 So you knew that this was a</p> <p>25 discrimination complaint; correct?</p>	<p>163</p> <p>1 when they were produced to me, and that will</p> <p>2 help us get through the pile, each report had</p> <p>3 one of these compliance call reports behind</p> <p>4 it. So you would have just created a template</p> <p>5 and then used it in response to each call?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And so any other communication where</p> <p>8 you discuss a template, Exhibit 29 and the</p> <p>9 other exhibits which we'll mark shortly are</p> <p>10 what you would have been referring to?</p> <p>11 A Referring to a template, I would</p> <p>12 call this a template, yes.</p> <p>13 Q Because I'm specifically asking --</p> <p>14 let me show you why I'm asking.</p> <p>15 (Whereupon a document was identified as</p> <p>16 Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.)</p> <p>17 Q I've handed you Exhibit 30, and it</p> <p>18 is an e-mail from Sheandra Clark to Deborah</p> <p>19 Kircher cc'ing Gail Perdue. Do you see that?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Now, if you look down -- and it's</p> <p>22 dated February 11th of 2013. If you look down</p> <p>23 to the bottom, you're going to see where it</p> <p>24 says, February 4th of 2013. It's an e-mail</p> <p>25 from you to Ms. Kircher. And you say,</p>
<p>164</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 (Whereupon a document was identified as</p> <p>3 Plaintiff's Exhibit 29.)</p> <p>4 Q Exhibit 29. Now, Exhibit 29 is</p> <p>5 entitled ACS/CGO Compliance Call Report. Do</p> <p>6 you see that?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Have you seen this document before?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Now, I need to ask you about this</p> <p>11 document. When they were produced to me,</p> <p>12 you'll see that Exhibit 28 is right in front of</p> <p>13 what was marked as Exhibit 29. Do these two</p> <p>14 documents go together? Like when you see them,</p> <p>15 when you have them, when you receive</p> <p>16 Exhibit 28, would Exhibit 29 be the response to</p> <p>17 it? Do they go together?</p> <p>18 A Exhibit 29 would be the response to</p> <p>19 the compliance calls, yes.</p> <p>20 Q Do you do one of these for each</p> <p>21 call? And when I say "these," I mean</p> <p>22 Exhibit 29.</p> <p>23 A I do a template to respond to every</p> <p>24 compliance call, yes.</p> <p>25 Q So that makes sense to me, because</p>	<p>166</p> <p>1 "Attached is the template completed for the six</p> <p>2 compliance calls."</p> <p>3 So when you say "template" in this</p> <p>4 e-mail, is Exhibit 29 what you would have been</p> <p>5 talking about?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And so Exhibit 29 you created as a</p> <p>8 template for responding to the compliance calls</p> <p>9 that had come in that involved Mr. Rodriques?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Who is Ms. Sheandra Clark?</p> <p>12 A She's one of our attorneys.</p> <p>13 Q And is she the attorney, if you</p> <p>14 know, who is responsible for the ethics and</p> <p>15 compliance hot line reporting?</p> <p>16 A Yes. That's my understanding.</p> <p>17 Q And who is Deborah Kircher?</p> <p>18 A At the time, Deb Kircher would have</p> <p>19 been a peer of mine.</p> <p>20 Q And when you say "a peer," tell me</p> <p>21 what position did she hold.</p> <p>22 A She would have also been an HR</p> <p>23 generalist/manager.</p> <p>24 Q In what location?</p> <p>25 A She was physically located in</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

47 (Pages 167 to 170)

167	169
<p>1 Cincinnati.</p> <p>2 Q And she would have held that</p> <p>3 position as of February 2013?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q So why would you have been sending</p> <p>6 the template to Ms. Kircher?</p> <p>7 A Deb had the responsibility for our</p> <p>8 HR team to track and ensure the compliance</p> <p>9 calls were complete in a timely fashion. So</p> <p>10 they filtered to her and then to Sheandra for</p> <p>11 review and closure.</p> <p>12 Q So it was Ms. Kircher's</p> <p>13 responsibility to make sure that, at least for</p> <p>14 your team -- and when you say your team, is it</p> <p>15 separated demographically or geographically?</p> <p>16 A It's separated by division.</p> <p>17 Q And at least for the division that</p> <p>18 included Detroit, it would also obviously</p> <p>19 include Cincinnati; correct?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And for that division, Ms. Kircher</p> <p>22 had the responsibility of making sure that the</p> <p>23 compliance calls were responded to timely?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q What is considered a timely response</p>	<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q Do you know what would happen after</p> <p>3 it would get to Ms. Clark, the response? Do</p> <p>4 you know what happens after it gets to</p> <p>5 Ms. Clark?</p> <p>6 A What do you mean, what happens?</p> <p>7 Q Yeah. Does she meet with a</p> <p>8 committee? Does she just review it and make a</p> <p>9 decision? Do you know any of that?</p> <p>10 A I can't speak to that.</p> <p>11 Q Good. It's okay. And then she</p> <p>12 indicates in Exhibit 30, Ms. Kircher, that she</p> <p>13 had conferred with you and Tyesha in January</p> <p>14 about those calls. Can you tell me about this</p> <p>15 conference?</p> <p>16 A I can't tell you about the details.</p> <p>17 I remember it occurring. And it typically</p> <p>18 would occur based upon the number of calls.</p> <p>19 Q Explain that a little bit more for</p> <p>20 me. So is it because it was so many calls?</p> <p>21 A I think in this particular case, you</p> <p>22 know, it was six calls about the same topic. I</p> <p>23 believe Sheandra requested the call, if I</p> <p>24 remember correctly, to say where are we at,</p> <p>25 what's going on, and Tyesha would have been</p>
168	170
<p>1 to those calls?</p> <p>2 A I believe at the time the guideline</p> <p>3 was 45 days.</p> <p>4 Q Within 45 days of the call coming</p> <p>5 in?</p> <p>6 A Correct.</p> <p>7 Q And then you said, now, did she</p> <p>8 have -- did Ms. Kircher have any other</p> <p>9 responsibility other than making sure it was on</p> <p>10 time?</p> <p>11 A No, not that I recall.</p> <p>12 Q I guess what I'm asking even more</p> <p>13 specifically is, did she review your work to</p> <p>14 make sure that the investigation was complete</p> <p>15 or she -- did she have any of those kind of</p> <p>16 responsibilities?</p> <p>17 A She would read it and make sure she</p> <p>18 understood it, but I don't know that she was</p> <p>19 really auditing the investigation. Right?</p> <p>20 She -- that wasn't her role.</p> <p>21 Q And then you said it filtered</p> <p>22 through her and then went to Ms. Clark?</p> <p>23 A Correct.</p> <p>24 Q Was there anybody between her and</p> <p>25 Ms. Clark who it went to?</p>	<p>1 involved because she was my leader.</p> <p>2 Q Was it unusual, as far as you know,</p> <p>3 to receive six calls about the same topic?</p> <p>4 A Unusual? It's happened before.</p> <p>5 Q How many times? More than five?</p> <p>6 A For me?</p> <p>7 Q Yeah. More than five?</p> <p>8 A No, probably not.</p> <p>9 Q And you said that you remember the</p> <p>10 conference happening, but you can't remember</p> <p>11 what the substance of the conference was?</p> <p>12 A Right. I remember talking about the</p> <p>13 calls. But the detailed conversation, I don't</p> <p>14 recall.</p> <p>15 Q And then Ms. Kircher also requested</p> <p>16 from Ms. Clark permission to close the file.</p> <p>17 Was that the standard process? You would send</p> <p>18 it to her, and she would request the close from</p> <p>19 Ms. Kircher?</p> <p>20 A From Ms. Clark?</p> <p>21 Q I'm sorry.</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Ms. Clark.</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q That's the standard process?</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

48 (Pages 171 to 174)

<p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q So you would not be the one who</p> <p>3 actually requested the close of the file?</p> <p>4 A Well, no. I would request it, but</p> <p>5 it would filter through Deb to get to Sheandra.</p> <p>6 Q So at some point, you said to</p> <p>7 Deborah, and here's what we got and can we</p> <p>8 close it, and so she would go from there and go</p> <p>9 to Ms. Clark and say here's what we've got and</p> <p>10 can we close it?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Did anyone come back and ask you</p> <p>13 questions as to why, according to Exhibit 29,</p> <p>14 you did not interview anyone about the call?</p> <p>15 A No.</p> <p>16 Q Did you ever ask Mr. De La Torre if</p> <p>17 he discriminated against Mr. Rodriques in the</p> <p>18 treatment?</p> <p>19 A Did I ask him that specific</p> <p>20 question? No.</p> <p>21 Q Did you ask Mr. Kotula whether he</p> <p>22 discriminated against Mr. Rodriques in handling</p> <p>23 this matter?</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 Q Did you ask Mr. Sarsour whether he</p>	<p>171</p> <p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 MS. BROCK: Can you read back her</p> <p>3 response to me as to why she did not ask them</p> <p>4 any of those questions?</p> <p>5 (Whereupon off-the-record discussions</p> <p>6 ensued.)</p> <p>7 (Whereupon the court reporter read back</p> <p>8 the referred-to portion as follows:)</p> <p>9 Q Why not? Why didn't you ask any of</p> <p>10 those questions?</p> <p>11 A I didn't ask them because the</p> <p>12 circumstances of the situation were different</p> <p>13 enough.</p> <p>14 (Whereupon the reading back was</p> <p>15 concluded.)</p> <p>16 Q And those were the circumstances as</p> <p>17 you knew it on that day; correct?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Sitting here today, do you know why</p> <p>20 Mr. Culpepper was not terminated in response to</p> <p>21 the November 2012 incidents, with an S?</p> <p>22 A When you say the November 12th,</p> <p>23 you're referring --</p> <p>24 Q November 2012. I'm sorry.</p> <p>25 A November 2012, you're referring to</p>
<p>172</p> <p>1 discriminated against Mr. Rodriques in handling</p> <p>2 this matter?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q Did you ask Mr. De La Torre whether</p> <p>5 Mr. Conover or Mr. Culpepper had been treated</p> <p>6 differently because of their race?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Did you ask Mr. Sarsour whether</p> <p>9 Mr. Conover or Mr. Culpepper were treated</p> <p>10 differently because of their races?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q Why not? Why didn't you ask any of</p> <p>13 those questions?</p> <p>14 A I didn't ask them because the</p> <p>15 circumstances of the situation were different</p> <p>16 enough.</p> <p>17 Q As you knew them on that day?</p> <p>18 A As I knew them on that day, that</p> <p>19 race was not a factor.</p> <p>20 Q Do you think, had you asked about</p> <p>21 what happened with Mr. Culpepper, somebody</p> <p>22 would have told you that we docked his pay?</p> <p>23 A I don't know.</p> <p>24 Q They wouldn't lie to you, out and</p> <p>25 out lie to you, would they?</p>	<p>174</p> <p>1 him providing authorization to Mr. Conover?</p> <p>2 Q And to his being missing for part of</p> <p>3 his shift on that same day.</p> <p>4 A That was -- well, we've established</p> <p>5 I wasn't aware of that.</p> <p>6 Q I understand.</p> <p>7 A So based upon what I knew at the</p> <p>8 time, he wasn't terminated because the offense</p> <p>9 and what he violated was not a terminable</p> <p>10 offense.</p> <p>11 Q Right. But my question was:</p> <p>12 Sitting here today, do you know why he wasn't</p> <p>13 terminated in response to those incidents?</p> <p>14 A Well, the answer would be the same.</p> <p>15 Q I just need you to say it.</p> <p>16 A Yeah.</p> <p>17 Q It's okay.</p> <p>18 A Okay. Yeah, the answer would be the</p> <p>19 same in that, based upon the findings of the</p> <p>20 investigation, it was not terminable.</p> <p>21 Q On your template, you indicate where</p> <p>22 it says attach all statements, you say all</p> <p>23 attachments were previously sent. Are you</p> <p>24 referring to the RFT file?</p> <p>25 A I can't speak to what I was</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

49 (Pages 175 to 178)

<p>1 referring to. Attach all statements, I don't 2 recall what, when I say previously sent, what 3 that would have meant.</p> <p>4 Q But you didn't obtain any documents 5 outside of the RFT file; correct?</p> <p>6 A Correct.</p> <p>7 Q And there's where you requested 8 closure; correct?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 (Whereupon a document was identified as 11 Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.)</p> <p>12 Q Exhibit 31 is Ethics and Compliance 13 Reporting number ending in 660. Do you see 14 that?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q This call came in on January 3rd of 17 2013. And in this call, it also indicates that 18 Mr. Domingo is the reported person; correct?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And this complaint also references 21 the Conover-Culpepper incident; correct?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q And it mentions Mr. Rodriques and 24 Mr. -- I believe his last name is Beydoun.</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p>175</p> <p>1 the discipline.</p> <p>2 MS. BROCK: -- we're specifically 3 talking about in response to this complaint.</p> <p>4 This is a race discrimination complaint that 5 was made to the hot line. And there were two 6 now we're talking about. We're talking about 7 report ending in 311 and report ending in 660, 8 was there an investigation into this complaint.</p> <p>9 She said she looked into it. She 10 said she didn't investigate it. And to the 11 best of her knowledge, nor about anyone else.</p> <p>12 (Whereupon a document was identified as 13 Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.)</p> <p>14 Q You've been handed Exhibit 22, and 15 it is --</p> <p>16 A I'm sorry. It says 32.</p> <p>17 Q Oh. 32. I am so sorry, Ms. Franz.</p> <p>18 I am sorry. Exhibit 32. And it is your 19 template for responding to the hot line calls; 20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And you would have filed this very 23 same template in response to call ending in 24 660; correct?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>
<p>176</p> <p>1 Q Correct? Did you open up any sort 2 of separate investigation for each of these 3 calls that came through?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q And you do recall receiving this 6 particular reporting form; correct?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And you were asked to conduct the 9 investigation as to this form; correct?</p> <p>10 A No. I would have been asked to look 11 into it, not specifically to conduct an 12 investigation.</p> <p>13 Q Very good distinction.</p> <p>14 A But yes.</p> <p>15 Q So what you did was not an 16 investigation in fact. You just looked into 17 the complaints that were here?</p> <p>18 A Correct.</p> <p>19 Q And to the best of your knowledge, 20 did anyone else conduct an investigation?</p> <p>21 A Not to my knowledge, no.</p> <p>22 MR. TUYN: Other than the 23 investigations that had already been conducted.</p> <p>24 MS. BROCK: Counsel --</p> <p>25 MR. TUYN: The determinations for</p>	<p>178</p> <p>1 (Whereupon a document was identified as 2 Plaintiff's Exhibit 33.)</p> <p>3 Q Exhibit 33 is hot line report ending 4 in the numbers 716. Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And this was a complaint made on 7 January 8th of 2013 at 6:08 p.m. Do you see 8 that?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q And this particular complaint 11 doesn't reference Mr. De La Torre, but it does 12 reference Mr. Rodriques and Mr. Fadi Beydoun; 13 correct?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And it also indicates that the 16 Caucasian employees were treated differently?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And it also indicates that the 19 caller feels that there is an issue of 20 discrimination involved here?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And you did receive report number 23 716 so that you could look into it; correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And you did in fact look into it;</p>

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

50 (Pages 179 to 182)

1 correct? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Now, I didn't hand you your template 4 in response to report number 716, but is it 5 true that you would have provided the same 6 template that we've been talking about here 7 today in response to complaint number 716? 8 A Yes. 9 (Whereupon a document was identified as 10 Plaintiff's Exhibit 34.) 11 Q Exhibit 34, you've been handed, is 12 compliance report number ending in 159, 13 reported on January 9th of 2013 at 4:40 p.m. 14 Do you see that? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And did you receive complaint number 17 159 to conduct so that you can look into it? 18 A Yes. 19 Q And did you in fact look into it? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And you were aware that this was 22 another race discrimination complaint; correct? 23 A Yes. 24 (Whereupon a document was identified as 25 Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.)	179	1 Compliance Reporting document ending in 421 to 2 look into it? 3 A Yes. 4 Q And did you in fact look into it? 5 A Yes. 6 Q And you were aware that this was yet 7 another complaint of race discrimination? 8 A Yes. 9 (Whereupon a document was identified as 10 Plaintiff's Exhibit 37.) 11 Q Exhibit 37 you've been handed is yet 12 another copy of your template. And please 13 understand, I keep giving them to you because 14 when they were produced to me they were 15 produced behind each of your reports or each of 16 the compliance hot line reports. And so I just 17 have to confirm that this was in response to 18 that report. Okay? 19 So the template that you have is 20 Exhibit 37. It would be the same template that 21 we've been speaking of here today; correct? 22 A Yes. 23 Q And this template would have been 24 filed in response to the complaint ending in 25 421; correct?	181
1 Q Exhibit 35 is another copy of your 2 template. Am I correct that you would have 3 provided this template in response to complaint 4 number 159? 5 A Yes. 6 Q And when I say "template," all of 7 the information in your templates were the 8 same; correct? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And you obtained all of that 11 information in the same way; correct? 12 A Yes. 13 Q So I guess what I'm asking is that 14 you didn't do something for number 311 that you 15 didn't do for number 159 or vice versa? 16 A No. 17 (Whereupon a document was identified as 18 Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.) 19 Q You've been handed Exhibit 36. 20 Exhibit 36 is an Ethics and Compliance 21 Reporting ending in the numbers 421, and it was 22 reported on January 9th of 2013 at 9:47 p.m. 23 Do you see that? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Now, did you receive this Ethics and	180	1 A Yes. 2 (Whereupon a document was identified as 3 Plaintiff's Exhibit 38.) 4 Q Ms. Franz, Exhibit 38 is an Ethics 5 and Compliance Reporting dated January 31st of 6 2013. Report was made at 2:29 p.m. Do you see 7 that? 8 A Yes. 9 Q The report number ends in the 10 numbers 995. Am I correct? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And did you receive this particular 13 report so that you could look into it; correct? 14 A Yes. 15 Q And did you in fact look into it? 16 A Yes. 17 Q And you were aware that this was yet 18 another complaint of race discrimination; 19 correct? 20 A Yes. 21 (Whereupon a document was identified as 22 Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.) 23 Q Ms. Franz, Exhibit 39 is your 24 template. Would you have filed the same 25 template in response to your compliance report	182

Barbara A. Franz

Rodrigues v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

51 (Pages 183 to 186)

<p>1 ending in 995?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And again for all of these</p> <p>4 templates, you didn't do anything different for</p> <p>5 this template as you did for any of the other</p> <p>6 responded templates; correct?</p> <p>7 A Correct.</p> <p>8 MS. BROCK: I have no other</p> <p>9 questions.</p> <p>10 MR. TUYN: I have just a couple.</p> <p>11 EXAMINATION</p> <p>12 BY MR. TUYN:</p> <p>13 Q Ms. Franz, with respect to your</p> <p>14 involvement in reviewing the request for</p> <p>15 termination that Mr. De La Torre gave you for</p> <p>16 Jerrick Rodrigues and the six hot line</p> <p>17 complaints that mentioned Mr. Rodrigues in any</p> <p>18 way, did you become aware of any evidence that</p> <p>19 Mr. Rodrigues was being discriminated against</p> <p>20 based on his race?</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q Did you become aware of any evidence</p> <p>23 that he was being retaliated against based on</p> <p>24 either his race or his engagement in any</p> <p>25 protected activity including raising claims of</p>	<p>183</p> <p>1 specific questions about the hot line</p> <p>2 complaints?</p> <p>3 A At the time the hot line complaints</p> <p>4 came in, no. I already had the information</p> <p>5 from the previous.</p> <p>6 Q From the previous investigations --</p> <p>7 A Correct.</p> <p>8 Q -- done by the other people?</p> <p>9 A Correct.</p> <p>10 Q Were those previous investigations</p> <p>11 into race discrimination?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q So in your looking into the six</p> <p>14 hot line calls for race discrimination, did you</p> <p>15 ask any specific questions about those calls?</p> <p>16 A No.</p> <p>17 Q And as far as Ms. Gray, did</p> <p>18 Ms. Gray, I understand she's African-American,</p> <p>19 did she investigate anything dealing with</p> <p>20 Mr. Rodrigues to the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>21 A I don't know. There was the one</p> <p>22 phone call, but I don't know if she</p> <p>23 specifically spoke to him. That would have</p> <p>24 been Ms. Austin. She's also African-American.</p> <p>25 So I don't -- I don't know what those</p>	<p>184</p> <p>1 race discrimination in the hot line complaints?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q Did you discriminate or retaliate</p> <p>4 against Mr. Rodrigues based on his race or his</p> <p>5 engagement in any protected activity including</p> <p>6 the hot line complaints?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Who did you say your boss was at the</p> <p>9 time?</p> <p>10 A Tyesha Gray.</p> <p>11 Q And do you know what her race is?</p> <p>12 A She is African-American.</p> <p>13 Q And you indicated that Sheandra</p> <p>14 Clark was the Delta in-house attorney that was</p> <p>15 overseeing the ethics and compliance hot line?</p> <p>16 A That's correct.</p> <p>17 Q Do you know her race?</p> <p>18 A She is African-American.</p> <p>19 MR. TUYN: That's all I have.</p> <p>20 MS. BROCK: I just have a few</p> <p>21 follow-up.</p> <p>22 RE-EXAMINATION</p> <p>23 BY MS. BROCK:</p> <p>24 Q Ms. Franz, in your looking into the</p> <p>25 six hot line calls, did you ask anyone any</p>	<p>185</p> <p>1 conversations were, if any.</p> <p>2 Q So let me ask it this way. Did she</p> <p>3 contact -- did Ms. Gray contact anyone, to your</p> <p>4 knowledge, at the Detroit location to inquire</p> <p>5 into Mr. Rodrigues's situation --</p> <p>6 A Not --</p> <p>7 Q -- other than you?</p> <p>8 A Not to my knowledge, no.</p> <p>9 Q Other than you? I mean, I'm sure</p> <p>10 she was e-mailing back and forth with you;</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A No. I mean, we wouldn't have</p> <p>13 exchanged e-mails, I don't believe.</p> <p>14 Q Oh. So she --</p> <p>15 A Other than the one that had the</p> <p>16 phone call in it from Ms. Austin, but.</p> <p>17 Q So any information Ms. Gray had</p> <p>18 would have only been the information you</p> <p>19 provided; correct?</p> <p>20 A To my knowledge.</p> <p>21 Q And the same thing with Ms. Austin.</p> <p>22 Did Ms. Austin conduct a separate investigation</p> <p>23 into any of Mr. Rodrigues's allegations?</p> <p>24 A Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>25 Q I understand that she's</p>
---	--	---	---

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

52 (Pages 187 to 190)

<p>1 African-American. So any information that she 2 would have had would have been, to the best of 3 your knowledge, the information you gave her; 4 correct?</p> <p>5 A Or the information that she received 6 from Mr. Rodriques in that call.</p> <p>7 Q And outside of that, she had no 8 additional information, to the best of your 9 knowledge?</p> <p>10 A To the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>11 Q Yeah. And we talked about Ms. Gray, 12 Ms. Austin, and Ms. Clark. Same thing with 13 Ms. Clark. Did Ms. Clark conduct any sort of 14 independent investigation into Mr. Rodriques's 15 complaints, to the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>16 A Not to the best of my knowledge, no.</p> <p>17 Q Did she ever contact you or have the 18 individual who, I'm blanking on it right now, 19 who's in Cincinnati call you and say, hey, I 20 was looking into this, and I found some 21 additional information?</p> <p>22 A No. The only conversation we would 23 have had was that January conversation. And I 24 don't recall the specifics, but Ms. Clark 25 certainly would have asked me some questions</p>	<p>187</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER 2 STATE OF GEORGIA 3 COUNTY OF COBB 4 I hereby certify that the foregoing 5 deposition was reported as stated in the 6 caption, and the questions and answers thereto 7 were reduced to writing by me; 8 That the witness's right to read and 9 sign the deposition was waived; 10 That the foregoing pages 1 through 190 11 represent a true, correct, and complete 12 transcript of the evidence given on the 13 above-referenced date by the witness, BARBARA 14 A. FRANZ, who was first duly sworn by me; 15 That I am not of kin or counsel to any 16 of the attorneys or parties in this case. 17 I do hereby disclose pursuant to 18 Article 10.B. of the Rules and Regulations of 19 the Board of Court Reporting of the Judicial 20 Council of Georgia that I am a Georgia 21 Certified Court Reporter; that I am an employee 22 of Donovan Reporting PC; that Donovan 23 Reporting PC was contacted by the attorney 24 taking the deposition to provide court 25 reporting services for this deposition; that I</p>
<p>188</p> <p>1 regarding, you know, where we were with the 2 investigation, but.</p> <p>3 Q And so any information Ms. Clark, 4 who I understand is an African-American, would 5 have received was the information you gave her 6 as far as you know?</p> <p>7 A Correct, or the compliance calls.</p> <p>8 Q So it was what was in the complaints 9 themselves, the six complaints, or what you 10 told her in response to those complaints?</p> <p>11 A Correct.</p> <p>12 MS. BROCK: I have no other 13 questions.</p> <p>14 MR. TUYN: I don't have anything 15 further.</p> <p>16 THE COURT REPORTER: Is she going to 17 reserve signature?</p> <p>18 MR. TUYN: She doesn't have to sign.</p> <p>19 THE COURT REPORTER: She does not 20 have to sign.</p> <p>21 MS. BROCK: No, no, she doesn't.</p> <p>22 THE COURT REPORTER: All right. 23 (Proceedings adjourned, 1:44 p.m.)</p>	<p>190</p> <p>1 am not taking this deposition under any 2 contract that is prohibited by OCGA 15-14-37(a) 3 and (b) or Article 7.C. of the Rules and 4 Regulations of the Board; and I am not 5 disqualified for a relationship of interest 6 under OCGA 9-11-28(c).</p> <p>7 There is no contract to provide 8 reporting services between myself or any person 9 with whom I have a principal and agency 10 relationship nor any attorney at law in this 11 action, party to this action, party having a 12 financial interest in this action, or agent for 13 an attorney at law in this action, party to 14 this action, or party having a financial 15 interest in this action. Any and all financial 16 arrangements beyond my usual and customary 17 rates have been disclosed and offered to all 18 parties.</p> <p>19 This 29th day of December, 2014.</p> <p>20</p> <p>21  22 JOEL P. MOYER, CCR 2745 23 Certified Court Reporter</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

A	37:17	61:1 147:11 159:6 159:7 174:14,18 answered 32:4,7 59:5 60:25 admitted 130:13 advise 35:16 advises 36:9 affectionately 22:4 affirmative 79:12 87:5,6,11,15,16 113:23 116:1 122:11 133:17 affirmatively 106:15 African-American 184:12,18 185:18 185:24 187:1 188:4 African-Americans 89:16,23 agency 190:9 agent 4:1,1 93:7 190:12 agents 23:14 25:21 ago 13:18 60:13 agree 38:8 agreed 103:13 agreement 38:23 ahead 61:3 134:14 159:3 Air 1:5,12 2:12 5:22 6:5,10,12,17,21 aircraft 34:25 airplane 91:8 airport 23:12 27:18 27:20 28:21 31:9 107:18 124:7 ALA 48:5,6 65:22,23 66:9,17 67:16 alert 28:20 alerted 28:15 Ali 5:5,10 123:25 124:3,17 125:18 161:6,7,8,17 allegations 186:23 alleged 20:9 allowable 7:21 allowed 55:24 amount 69:12 Andrew 105:10,12 and/or 17:14 anonymous 153:2 163:20 answer 8:7,21 9:21 11:3 32:5 40:14,23	74:20 80:8 98:22 123:18 127:7 134:8 134:11 136:5 147:19 160:18,20 172:20 176:8,10 187:25 anybody 168:24 anymore 90:15 127:16 155:10 anytime 40:2 anyways 40:25 apologies 100:4 appeal 118:25 124:20 124:24 126:15 139:5 141:18 152:2 157:23 appeals 126:20 Appearance 3:19 82:17 APPEARANCES 2:1 appears 29:12 79:2 82:15,20 90:7 91:21 104:3 109:22 120:8 applicable 86:11 apply 32:19,25 appreciate 73:13 appreciated 150:8,11 appropriate 19:9 34:24 38:9 40:6 approval 102:14 105:4,22,24 106:1,5 112:1 approved 106:2,9,19 107:9,13 132:21,24 approximately 139:16 April 14:20 21:6,8 22:14 126:24 128:24 140:4 151:4 152:15 area 11:23 53:8,11 54:10 56:5,13 65:2 155:11 argue 150:10 argument 134:15 argument's 134:5 arrangements 190:16 Article 7:5 189:18 190:3 asked 24:21 37:2 49:18 60:25 65:3 72:13,18 73:20	36:25 37:16 41:8 43:6,7 65:23 67:16 67:20 145:7 authorization 53:7 53:22 56:5,10 59:9 66:15 67:7 136:12 137:4 143:4 174:1 automated 161:5 automatic 161:2 auto-populated 95:10,11 available 16:21 Avenue 2:9 average 110:16 aware 17:15 27:5 28:9,20 35:24 36:1 36:4 37:4 39:13 assume 21:11 23:25 77:25 140:25 assumption 141:23 ATL 152:6 Atlanta 1:12 2:13 33:5 81:6 124:8,12 148:2 155:2,8 attach 174:22 175:1 attached 109:19 166:1 attachment 123:8 attachments 98:18 174:23 attend 11:14,20 16:10 attendance 34:22 64:14 92:9,13 108:13 145:4 attendants 31:5 attended 12:10 attention 35:22 36:12 110:19 118:23 119:4 attest 125:1 attorney 7:16 8:3,10 10:7 38:15 47:2 137:8 166:13 184:14 189:23 190:10,13 attorneys 2:3 18:4 166:12 189:16 auditing 168:19 Austin 185:24 186:16 186:21,22 187:12 bad 50:24 badly 41:5 Barb 40:12 151:5
B				
		b 190:3 bachelor 11:25 back 12:4 25:15 37:3 37:14 39:17,19 40:24 47:25 48:10 50:13 55:12 68:15 68:22 69:16 70:25 73:19,20 97:22 100:11 117:4 133:10 137:6 148:3 149:19 153:7 159:10,21 171:12 173:2,7,14 186:10 bad 50:24 badly 41:5 Barb 40:12 151:5		

Barbara 1:8 3:3 4:6 4:10,14,16 5:1,3,7 5:10,12,15,20 7:7 7:14 189:13 based 19:7 33:23 34:11 35:17 42:23 61:14 65:1 66:7 70:18 74:15 89:2,8 101:21 120:7 129:9 133:4 143:14,19 152:14 157:10 158:4,5 163:16,19 169:18 174:7,19 183:20,23 184:4 basically 15:10 29:12 36:9 37:5 96:7 basis 16:10 Bates 150:23 becoming 21:1 22:7 29:13 before-awareness 61:25 began 14:20 25:18 99:24 Beginning 1:14 believe 12:13 14:1 20:6 23:6 30:4 36:16 44:23 88:13 91:15 97:16 100:7 104:8 144:10,15 159:1 168:2 169:23 175:24 186:13 believed 137:25 Bell 127:8,10,25 128:2 140:23 below-the-wing 23:16 25:19 43:24 below-wing 31:3,11 107:19 belt 35:3 40:1 benefit 30:12,14 benefits 15:8 25:9 26:1,10 29:18,24 31:25 32:12 best 8:6 73:5 80:19 85:7 89:15 97:10 111:1 124:15 126:8 155:12,21 176:19 177:11 185:20 187:2,8,10,15,16 better 18:5 136:18,24 136:24	Beydoun 76:6 159:12 175:24 178:12 beyond 40:16 190:16 bid 27:17,23 bidding 29:5 big 91:7 big-picture 15:10 Birmingham 2:9 bit 8:4 20:16 21:19 38:10 45:9 49:15 79:19 90:10 91:22 112:23 117:5 118:24 119:12 140:3 141:3 169:19 black 83:1 blank 123:8,9,10 blanking 187:18 blindsight 119:2 block 5:18 139:3 Board 7:6 189:19 190:4 body 122:19 book 18:6,8 boss 102:11 122:6,6 184:8 bottom 83:25 84:11 90:12 102:13 150:24,25 153:8 165:23 Boulevard 2:12 box 104:9 brand 17:25 break 9:17,22 21:19 71:24 73:13,17 138:20 breaking 24:23 bring 16:22 20:12 27:20 35:21 110:19 brings 20:8 Brock 1:9 2:3 3:4,5 7:11,15 17:18 18:3 21:14,18,23 23:18 23:24 24:6,20 47:1 54:20 55:5 59:2 60:11,17,21 63:13 64:21 71:25 73:12 78:3,6,9 117:17,19 118:1,4,8 134:2,8 134:11,22 135:21 138:21 140:16 147:24 148:7,22 149:2,13,18 150:8	C C 4:3 cabinet 46:2 call 6:1,8,15,20 27:8 28:22 31:9 32:3,6 38:23 77:1,10,18 81:10,17,18,19,23 93:15,20 107:1 124:25 153:2,11 156:9 158:9 163:20 164:5,21,24 165:3,5 165:12 168:4 169:23 171:14 175:16,17 177:23 185:22 186:16 187:6,19 called 91:17 93:18 132:4 caller 162:15 163:16 178:19 calling 81:24,25 calls 76:19 77:2,7,13 77:22 164:19 166:2 166:8 167:9,23 168:1 169:14,18,20 169:22 170:3,13 176:3 177:19 184:25 185:14,15 188:7 capacity 65:23 caption 189:6 card 35:9,20 48:24 48:24 49:2 53:2,3 53:18 54:9 55:23 56:7,8 58:16,23	59:1,6,11 60:10,19 61:16 62:6,12,18 63:2,4,5,18 65:14 65:20 66:11 67:2,6 67:10,14 69:6 100:1 117:9,13 121:6 122:21,24 133:8,15,23 134:10 135:1,3,8,12 136:4 136:8,17,20 137:2,3 137:14 138:6 140:1 141:14 141:17 142:1 142:14 143:1 143:17 144:1 144:18 145:1 145:2 146:1 146:14 147:1 147:17 148:1 148:18 149:1 149:19 150:1 150:2 151:1 151:14 change 36:14,19,23 58:17 121:9,12,13 121:17 changed 21:7,20 23:4 24:9,12,13,17 68:25 69:14 92:6 113:2,3 120:24 changes 31:13,18,22 31:22 42:23 120:23 check 151:24 checklist 4:11 104:3 104:4 Chicago 13:17,24 chose 27:23 Chris 142:12 143:1 148:9 158:24 Christmas 163:13 Christopher 3:13,15 44:14 65:11 68:11 Cincinnati 167:1,19 187:19 circumstance 51:9 57:25 75:20 circumstances 20:6 33:14,16,24 34:15 35:25 42:11,21 51:7,11,15 70:19 75:2,4,17 87:10 141:8 142:21,24 172:15 173:12,16 Civil 7:22 claim 119:10 132:9 claiming 158:25 claims 155:16 159:16 183:25 clarification 25:13 59:15 clarify 10:22 37:22 41:1,6 77:23 Clark 6:3 165:18 166:11 168:22,25 169:3,5 170:16,20 170:23 171:9 184:14 187:12,13 187:13,24 188:3 clear 31:17 35:10 clock 53:7 54:4 56:12 57:21 66:25 110:13 112:10 133:13 158:25
---	--	---	--

clocks 145:20	175:20 177:3,4,8	conference 169:15	contacted 156:10	65:25 66:4 68:17
close 170:16,18 171:3	178:6,10 179:7,16	170:10,11	159:17,17,20,24	68:20 69:18,22,25
171:8,10	179:22 180:3 181:7	conference 169:13	189:23	71:22 72:15 73:3
closure 167:11 175:8	181:24 182:18	Confidential 3:18,21	contain 13:24	78:22,23 79:3
coaching 3:15 50:21	complaints 78:1	3:23 4:3,5,13,16,18	content 123:7,9,13	82:19 83:3 89:20
68:10 69:3,21	148:18 157:3	4:20,22 5:1,3,7,9,12	context 131:25	90:8 92:2,21 95:22
COBB 189:3	176:17 183:17	5:14,19,22 6:1,3,5,8	continue 38:22 56:6	96:21 97:1,9 98:2
Code 94:21	184:1,6 185:2,3	6:10,12,15,17,19,21	Continued 4:25 5:25	101:16 102:3
collect 18:23	187:15 188:8,9,10	6:24	continues 81:22	104:20 106:4
collected 19:6,14	complete 167:9	confirm 132:15 152:3	contract 190:2,7	107:15 108:2,7
collecting 153:3	168:14 189:11	152:10 181:17	contractor 86:22,23	109:12 110:23
come 22:4 27:7,10,11	completed 104:10	confirmation 149:21	87:1	111:16,20 112:1,10
27:17 38:16 40:24	107:2 166:1	Conover 3:11 44:14	conversation 93:25	112:14,25 113:4
67:13,13 68:15	completely 154:4	44:22 45:6,18,22	101:22 103:3	114:5,8 115:14
87:11 92:14 117:8	compliance 5:22 6:1	47:4 48:2 49:14,18	113:15 119:25	118:14,15 121:6
118:24,25 119:3	6:6,8,10,13,15,17	49:22 52:13 53:1,2	121:12 129:6,17	122:5,17,21 124:21
131:3 159:10 166:9	6:19,22,24 76:7	53:10 54:16,16	131:15,19,21,22	125:19,23 126:11
171:12	77:1,1,7,10,13,22	55:3,10,14 57:14	132:18,20 137:17	127:5,8 128:10,17
comes 10:25 40:9	81:23 82:4 86:11	58:16 60:7 61:15	140:14 142:22	129:3,10,11 130:15
95:1 160:21,24	153:2 156:19 164:5	62:5,9,24 63:1,9,17	150:15 170:13	130:16,19 133:23
comfortable 9:19	164:19,24 165:3	64:20 66:2 71:3,6,9	187:22,23	137:24 138:1,8,9,11
61:1 85:19 150:25	166:2,8,15 167:8,23	72:18 73:21 133:12	conversations 150:21	139:13 140:23
coming 25:1 28:11,18	175:12 179:12	133:14 135:15	186:1	141:21 142:2
28:23 29:6 119:8	180:20 181:1,16	142:1,12 143:2,4,8	coordinating 84:14	143:17,18,23 145:2
123:20 159:21	182:5,25 184:15	144:17 145:16	coordinator 108:14	145:9,24 146:3
168:4	188:7	146:2,5 147:16	124:5 145:5 161:12	147:4 153:13,23
comment 140:20	components 157:9	148:9,14 154:2,9	copied 97:17,19	154:9,14,16 155:22
152:4	158:15,18	172:5,9 174:1	copy 87:13 123:18	155:24 162:11,13
commit 54:8 58:23	computer 18:25	Conover's 47:10 50:2	180:1 181:12	162:20 163:25
62:11 78:17	19:16	56:16 58:14 59:18	corporate 16:24	167:19 168:6,23
committed 58:16	concern 18:19 82:8	61:11 64:17,24	34:21 81:11,13	173:17 175:5,6,8,18
78:21 79:9,16	concerning 77:24	143:25 144:22	112:1 114:19,24	175:21 176:1,6,9,18
121:5	concerns 82:6	146:7	115:1 120:15	177:20,24 178:13
committee 169:8	concluded 173:15	Conover-Culpepper	125:22 127:19	178:23 179:1,22
communicating	conclusion 117:9	47:6 73:18 151:23	155:13 158:9 160:4	180:2,8,11 181:21
163:7	120:9	175:21	160:8,12	181:25 182:10,13
communication	conduct 3:19 12:7	consider 32:11 62:5	corporately 30:12,16	182:19 183:6,7
144:15 149:3	13:25 16:7,15 17:6	138:2,6 146:13,16	corporation 30:22	184:16 185:7,9
160:13 165:7	17:8 19:18 33:21	consideration 96:25	38:17	186:11,19 187:4
communications	64:16 74:9 82:16	137:8	correct 12:11 17:10	188:7,11 189:11
148:3	86:5 155:15 157:2	considered 53:3,18	19:24 21:3,10 22:7	corrected 82:9
companies 25:8	157:18 158:2 176:8	53:20 56:7 67:2,6	22:8,18 23:3,17	111:22
company 35:19 92:17	176:11,20 179:17	119:21 120:6	25:23 26:3 27:9	correction 114:22
153:16,21	186:22 187:13	133:23 167:25	29:17 30:7,19	corrective 3:10,12
company's 86:21	conducted 31:14 76:8	considering 58:13	31:25 34:6 35:6	43:22 50:21 52:13
87:5,6,9	76:12 80:7 100:2	59:17,24 157:25	36:7 37:9,13 39:14	65:9 69:1
comparables 39:5	143:15,17 157:6,11	considers 63:21	39:15 41:10,23	correctly 143:6
compare 68:23	159:15 160:9	consist 44:21	42:3,4 48:3,7,8	169:24
comparing 145:19	176:23	consistent 75:9	49:20 50:17 51:13	Council 189:20
complainant 19:11	conducting 15:9	consists 85:2	52:22 54:2,7 55:16	counsel 2:1 7:4 9:8
complaint 18:13,18	18:10,11,15 26:17	contact 17:17 81:8	55:21 60:1 61:13	10:4 22:3 35:17
20:9 157:7 163:25	confer 128:2	186:3,3 187:17	61:16 62:6,7 65:24	117:20 147:24

149:19 150:22 151:21 176:24 189:15 counsels 36:9 count 128:9 County 45:14 72:22 109:5,5 110:2,7 112:4 113:6,21 143:9 144:4 145:1 145:9,13 189:3 couple 8:20 69:9 183:10 course 12:5 36:6 103:11 courses 13:13 court 1:1,10 7:6 8:8 9:3 173:7 188:16 188:19,22 189:1,19 189:21,24 190:22 cover 83:21 87:22,22 149:16 covered 72:6 crazy 126:8 create 8:11 89:4 created 165:4 166:7 creating 8:12 Culpepper 3:13,15 44:15,23 45:6,19,22 47:25 48:2,13,18,23 49:19 52:21 53:25 54:3,8,15,17,18,25 55:2,9,11,20,24 62:22 65:11,18 66:2,23 67:4,10 68:2,12 69:17 71:5 71:9 72:18,20,23 73:2,21 100:5 133:5,12 135:14,22 136:3 142:2,12 143:1,3 144:17 145:17 146:2,5,11 146:11,13 147:16 148:9,13 154:2,8,12 156:4 158:25 172:5 172:9,21 173:20 Culpepper's 47:9 49:8 50:19 57:18 70:3,9 72:1 73:4 143:8,25 144:23 culture 39:20 curious 18:4 current 20:16 127:14	customary 190:16 customer 23:12,14 25:21 31:10 107:19 124:7 cut 129:21 D D 2:11 Danielle 46:23 data 88:16 108:8 151:24 153:3 date 69:17 84:21 95:1 95:2,10 96:11,12,14 104:9,18 106:6,10 110:21 111:6,19,20 112:3 113:2,3,25 114:22 118:13,19 118:20 119:6,13,15 119:21,23 120:6,17 127:3,5 128:4,8 137:18,19 138:11 139:20,21 189:13 dated 3:11,13,16,19 3:22 4:4,6,8,9,14,17 4:19,21 5:1,3,5,8,10 5:13,15,18,20,23 6:4,6,11,13,18,22 68:16 98:17 99:16 102:1 107:24 109:17 111:10 112:18 121:25 123:3,24 125:8,18 128:24 139:3 165:22 182:5 dates 93:24 96:17,20 96:24 97:2,9 101:12 103:16,18 110:22 111:15 113:22 120:8 daughter's 11:16 day 49:25 50:7 57:20 58:11 61:7 62:11 68:5 101:9 106:10 106:13,19 119:17 120:19 130:1,22,24 130:24 131:5,18 132:10,13,17,22 133:8,14 146:21 148:23 172:17,18 173:17 174:3 190:19 days 26:20 168:3,4	day-to-day 84:14,24 86:2,15 De 4:19,21 5:5 44:4,7 64:5 96:5 97:19 98:17 99:2,6 100:21 101:5,19 102:19 103:8,18 109:17 110:25 111:5,11,14 112:19 112:24 117:6,11 119:5 120:14,22 121:8,17 123:25 124:18 127:4,8 128:6,14 129:1,7,22 130:13 137:9,25 140:5,23 157:16 158:6 159:11 162:20 171:16 172:4 178:11 183:15 Deakins 2:7 dealing 185:19 Deb 166:18 167:7 171:5 Deborah 6:4 165:18 166:17 171:7 December 1:13 7:1 95:17 98:17 99:16 101:12 102:2 104:20 107:2,24 109:17 111:10 112:18 121:25 123:4 190:19 decide 32:25 43:7 decided 43:9,10 decides 41:20 deciding 43:11 decipher 9:12 decision 19:7 35:18 35:19 36:3,11,13,17 36:19,19,24 39:9,17 39:19 41:9,12,13,15 41:23 42:5,24 57:9 62:17 74:8,13 75:9 124:20,24 146:9 169:9 decisions 44:6 declined 162:16 Defendant 1:6 2:6 define 59:3,7 85:24 defined 58:25 defining 147:2	definition 82:25 83:16 DEF-000041 4:10 DEF-000042 4:21 DEF-000044 4:12 DEF-000054 4:2 DEF-000055 5:6 DEF-000057 4:8 DEF-000058 5:18 DEF-000062 5:18 DEF-000093 3:17 DEF-000095 5:23 DEF-000096 5:23 DEF-000097 6:1 DEF-000098 6:2 DEF-000099 6:7 DEF-000100 6:7 DEF-000101 6:8 DEF-000102 6:9 DEF-000103 6:14 DEF-000104 6:14 DEF-000105 6:15 DEF-000106 6:16 DEF-000107 6:18 DEF-000108 6:18 DEF-000109 6:20 DEF-000110 6:20 DEF-000111 6:23 DEF-000112 6:23 DEF-000113 6:24 DEF-000121 3:22 DEF-000123 3:22 DEF-000124 3:24 DEF-000129 3:24 DEF-000132 3:20 DEF-000136 3:20 DEF-000166 3:13 DEF-000167 3:14 DEF-000174 3:11 DEF-000175 3:11 DEF-000176 5:2 DEF-000181 5:4 DEF-000193 4:17 DEF-000196 5:21 DEF-000197 5:21 DEF-000210 4:15 DEF-000211 4:15 DEF-000222 5:16 DEF-000224 5:16 DEF-000226 5:13 DEF-000227 5:13 DEF-000231 5:8
--	---	--	--

depending 30:10	differentiate 24:4	77:10,18 78:17,21	164:2,8,11 165:15	106:10,20 152:15
deposed 7:25	differentiated 148:19	79:10,17,20,22 80:3	175:10 177:12	either 12:18 35:14
deposition 1:8 7:18	differentiating 85:20	80:6,12,17,22 81:1	178:1 179:9,24	40:11 91:9 135:19
7:19 10:4 13:4	143:2	157:4 163:25 177:4	180:17 181:1,9	145:6 183:24
189:5,9,24,25 190:1	differently 83:10	178:20 179:22	182:2,21	elaborate 14:10
depositions 18:6	153:18,20,23 172:6	181:7 182:18 184:1	documentation 74:8	election 31:20 130:24
Dept 2:12	172:10 178:16	185:11,14	74:19 93:25 150:18	137:21
describe 35:13	difficult 151:22	discriminatory	documented 75:11	electronic 93:17
description 120:24	direct 41:22 81:16	163:20,22	documents 45:25	151:24
desk 40:10	122:5	discuss 102:19,23	46:3,4 49:17 71:4	emphasis 12:1
detail 18:19 19:11	directly 85:6 101:14	156:9 165:8	98:19,23 99:2	employed 20:20
103:20	153:16	discussed 4:1 66:24	148:2,4 149:20	89:11,16,24 152:20
detailed 170:13	director 84:13,16	93:6	164:14 175:4	employee 5:17 22:6,7
details 169:16	directory 81:11,12,13	discussion 103:6,7,10	29:13 32:2 34:3	29:13 32:2 34:3
determinations	disagree 37:23 38:4	discussions 173:5	35:1 36:21 41:10	35:1 36:21 41:10
176:25	disciplinary 44:5	disqualified 190:5	41:21 50:24 51:2,3	41:21 50:24 51:2,3
determine 19:13,19	63:22 71:2	distinction 23:21	51:20 54:9 55:24	51:20 54:9 55:24
19:21,23	discipline 26:2,14	29:22,23 176:13	56:23 57:10,21	56:23 57:10,21
determined 51:23	33:9 34:4,8,13 35:9	DISTRICT 1:1,1	59:7 65:5 66:6,10	59:7 65:5 66:6,10
113:12 120:25	37:3,15,17 41:9,21	Diversity 79:11	66:18 95:7,9	66:18 95:7,9
Detroit 22:1 23:10,13	41:25 42:7,24 43:8	division 167:16,17,21	105:20 112:4 113:7	105:20 112:4 113:7
23:15 25:1 31:1	43:10,12,20 44:10	DM 42:7,14,15,16,17	114:3 124:14	114:3 124:14
34:2 35:23 36:21	44:19 45:25 48:10	42:22,23,23 43:13	127:12 155:5	127:12 155:5
51:2 52:4,5 74:23	49:1 50:20 51:4,5	43:15,16,17,18,21	159:14 189:21	159:14 189:21
76:19 87:8,11,15	51:16 52:6,7,16,19	44:10 100:6	employees 18:20	18:20
88:17 89:12,17,22	60:8 61:10 63:8,17	dock 146:6	20:14 23:13,15	20:14 23:13,15
148:2 152:5 158:10	64:10,12,18 66:25	docked 48:18 49:9	27:17,19 28:10,16	27:17,19 28:10,16
163:23 167:18	67:15,19 69:13	50:3,11 56:16,22	29:5 30:17 31:3,11	29:5 30:17 31:3,11
186:4	70:3,9 102:20,24	57:19 58:15,22	32:3,6 33:8,11 56:4	32:3,6 33:8,11 56:4
Detroit's 87:14	177:1	59:18,25 61:12	70:14 89:24 104:13	70:14 89:24 104:13
development 15:22	disciplined 48:14,23	62:3,9,16 65:5 68:2	104:15 110:18	104:15 110:18
40:7 93:18	51:3 54:19 63:5,10	68:4 144:9 146:23	Dowdell 151:6,11	141:5,6 142:5,9,10
difference 25:4 82:24	63:17,19 64:25	156:3,5 172:22	152:1,6,12,16,20	153:12,18,22 154:3
141:5 147:19	65:19,21,22 67:10	docking 156:2	draft 139:12	178:16
148:15	67:23 80:3	document 3:23 4:1	draw 120:9	employee's 51:16
differences 24:24	disciplines 34:3 44:14	5:17 52:9 62:19	drive 126:8	56:21
25:16 29:9 31:16	64:8	68:7 78:24 82:12	driving 35:2	employee-relations
69:10	disciplining 33:8,11	83:23 84:22 85:11	32:9	32:9
different 16:14,18,19	disclose 189:17	90:1,4,8,25,25	duly 7:8 189:14	employment 4:12
16:20 24:1 25:11	disclosed 190:17	91:12,13,18 93:3	20:15 22:12 38:15	20:15 22:12 38:15
26:4,15,19 27:2	disclosure 7:4	94:2,21,21 95:15	99:23	99:23
28:4 31:23 37:9	discovery 150:6	98:14,20 99:14,21	encouragement	156:17
39:17,19 41:2 49:7	discrepancies 137:11	101:24 104:1	1ended 98:6,10	1ended 98:6,10
51:24 60:16 65:4	discrepancy 20:13	107:20 109:14	ends 182:9	ends 182:9
78:1 90:10 91:22	95:25 96:7,15,18	111:8 112:16	engage 60:10	engage 60:10
108:16 112:23	discriminate 184:3	113:16 117:22	engagement 183:24	184:5
141:8 142:20,25	discriminated 171:17	118:3 121:20 123:1	184:5	184:5
146:1,14,17 147:1	171:22 172:1	123:21 125:5,15	enrollment 15:9	184:5
147:15,18,21,23	183:19	126:12 128:19	ensued 173:6	184:5
154:4 155:11 162:6	discriminating 79:25	138:24 139:3,7,12	ensure 167:8	184:5
163:11 172:15	discrimination 18:13	140:13 149:4	ensuring 86:10	184:5
173:12 183:4	34:21 76:20 77:5	152:22 156:13,24		

entering 114:4	95:19 98:15,16	128:22 129:5,22,24	Felicia 1:9 2:3 7:15	folks 28:20 31:7
enters 13:3	99:15,16 100:11	129:25 140:3,21	Felicia's 40:12	43:25
entire 50:3 56:24,25	101:25 102:1 104:2	144:15 145:8	felt 98:3 153:17,22	follow 34:23 37:20
57:11 61:12 85:10	104:3 107:21,22	149:17 152:11,25	163:21	83:4,6,12,14 85:14
entitled 3:24 82:16	109:15,16 111:9,10	160:21,24,25 161:4	figure 47:23	127:7 128:13
90:4 164:5	112:17,18 113:17	161:25 165:18,24	file 4:7 46:2,9,10	140:20
entry 114:1,4 115:5	113:18 115:23	166:4	70:22 71:2 72:20	following 15:12
EO 140:14 161:17	117:6,16,16 118:11	e-mailing 186:10	72:23 73:5,11 74:2	18:22 19:2 85:2
EPD 93:19	120:23,23 121:4,21	e-mails 126:24	74:3,15,19 75:8	follows 7:9 173:8
equal 15:16 39:3 81:3	121:23 123:2,3,22	144:16 148:1 153:7	98:24 99:3,7,11,21	follow-up 184:21
81:7 84:13,15,16,18	123:23 125:6,7,16	186:13	99:22,23 101:13,13	foregoing 189:4,10
84:25 85:7,24 86:1	125:17 126:13,14	F	101:22 108:20,22	forget 48:11,12
126:17,19	128:20,22 137:7,9	facilitated 15:15 16:2	109:2,6,9 111:5	forgot 10:20
equivalent 93:16,19	138:25 139:2	facility 27:18	120:13 129:15	form 149:21 156:19
era 27:23	152:23,24,24	fact 66:24,25 71:3	147:8 170:16 171:3	176:6,9
essence 141:20	156:14,18 164:3,4,4	99:1 111:4 114:7	174:24 175:5	formal 15:14
essentially 78:1	164:12,13,16,16,18	116:25 117:1,11	filed 177:22 181:24	format 92:5
established 174:4	164:22 165:8,16,17	119:12,22 122:23	182:24	formats 92:3
estimate 76:11	166:4,7 169:12	128:16 134:13	files 46:14 74:10	formatting 90:9
estimated 112:12	171:13 175:11,12	137:15 143:5	filter 171:5	former 73:5 161:8
ethics 5:22 6:6,10,13	177:13,14,18 178:2	factor 147:2 172:19	filtered 167:10	forth 20:8,11 71:1
6:17,22 76:7,10	178:3 179:10,11,25	factors 143:3 147:6,7	168:21	148:3 186:10
81:23 82:4 156:18	180:1,18,19,20	facts 54:14	final 3:10 43:22	forward 14:24 15:3
157:2 166:14	181:10,11,20 182:3	Fadi 159:12 178:12	52:12 112:1	162:4
175:12 180:20,25	182:4,22,23	fair 49:1 84:4 141:22	financial 190:12,14	forwarded 161:20
182:4 184:15	exhibits 165:9	fairly 23:6	190:15	162:7
events 120:21	exist 94:11,15	fairness 133:2	find 39:16 49:8 78:20	forwarding 161:23
eventually 27:7	existed 80:22	falsified 116:19	88:21 159:21	found 47:24 48:12
everybody 18:2	experience 44:7	familiar 90:9 151:20	findings 174:19	49:23 50:15 78:16
Everybody's 94:14	expired 13:11	far 15:1 57:15 67:22	fine 18:7 118:8	79:15,21 80:22
evidence 7:23 18:23	explain 20:5 34:18	74:13 75:10 89:4	138:21	92:16 131:23,25
19:14 54:14,15	42:10 94:10 137:12	89:10 96:23 135:13	finish 72:1	187:20
75:11 118:5 133:25	137:15,19 169:19	138:9 146:10	finished 161:14	foundation 54:13
134:3 135:19	explained 148:15	148:15 150:13	firms 86:5	118:7,9 135:19
183:18,22 189:12	explains 141:4	158:8,11 160:8	first 5:17 7:8 14:16	foundational 133:24
exactly 20:11 91:16	explanation 52:3	170:2 185:17 188:6	18:17 52:25 57:14	four 48:18 49:9 57:19
149:13	137:24 138:1,3,6,8	fashion 31:21 167:9	58:25 65:15 68:22	57:22 58:10 68:2,5
Examination 3:2,4,5	138:10,17 154:7	fax 149:20	76:7 79:10 83:21	86:16 96:17,20,24
7:10 183:11	extend 53:12	faxed 149:16	84:10,12,22 86:3,7	97:2,3,9 110:21
examined 7:8	extra 17:18	faxing 149:20	95:1 99:20 113:24	111:15 115:18
example 16:23 35:1	e-mail 4:3,3,5,13,14	February 165:22,24	139:3 140:8 189:14	fourth 86:19
excerpt 3:17,18,21	4:16,16 5:1,3,5,7,7	167:3	five 13:21 110:18	frame 12:5 49:11
exchanged 186:13	5:9,10,12,12,14,15	federal 7:21,22 86:21	112:13 170:5,7	50:10,19
exercise 75:23	5:19,20 6:3,3 28:22	86:22 87:1	fix 37:1	Francis 4:14 107:23
Exhibit 3:8,9 52:10	95:17,21,24 96:5,21	feed 94:14	fixed 82:9	109:11,21
52:12 62:20,25	97:12,17 98:16	feeding 117:23,24	flight 31:4	Franz 1:8 3:3 4:6,10
63:1 65:9 68:8,10	107:22,23 108:4	97:17,21,24 96:5,21	flights 9:16	4:14,16 5:1,3,7,10
68:23 69:1,2,17,20	109:16,25 111:1	125:7,17,21 126:14	flip 151:1	5:12,15,20 7:7,12
78:25 79:2 80:25	121:25 122:4,19	126:24 128:7,11,21	fluid 37:24 38:21	7:14,24 10:1,3,14
82:13,15 90:2,3,22	123:3,7,9,13,19,23	feel 61:1 156:8	focus 32:8 137:8	52:11 65:8 68:9
91:19,20,21 92:2	125:7,17,21 126:14	feels 178:19	focused 12:19 32:9	79:1 82:14 90:4
93:4,6 94:2,6 95:16	126:24 128:7,11,21		32:10 103:22	95:17 121:22

128:22 139:1 141:21 148:11 150:4 152:24 177:17 182:4,23 183:13 184:24 189:14 fraud 35:9 48:24,25 49:2 53:2,3,19 54:9 55:23 56:7,8 58:16 58:23 59:1,6,12 60:10,20 61:16 62:6,12,18 63:2,4,5 63:18 65:14,20 66:12 67:2,6,11,14 69:6 117:10,13 121:6 122:21,24 133:9,15,23 135:3 135:12 136:4,8 137:3 159:1 fraudulently 121:1,9 free 79:9,16 156:8 frequently 121:12 front 36:25 37:14,18 91:8 164:12 fully 41:3 further 30:2 71:24 117:8 141:3 152:14 156:9 188:15 F-R-A-N-Z 7:14	G GA 2:13 Gail 165:19 gain 105:20 general 1:12 12:21 42:24 44:6 64:5 77:2,8 100:9 154:24 155:9 161:9 161:13 generalist 22:11,17 22:19,25 generalist/HR 23:10 23:19 generalist/manager 33:7 51:1 70:13 73:22 166:23 generally 29:2 80:9 geographically 167:15 Georgia 1:12 21:2 32:16 189:2,20,20 getting 21:15,18	54:10 126:7 Giustina 2:11 10:8 17:20,24 give 8:13,25 9:2 29:1 29:2 40:8 51:8 64:8 66:9 75:19 80:13 100:12 105:11 128:12 given 17:6 53:6,10,22 56:4 61:1 119:6 127:5 138:8,11 160:22 189:12 giving 54:9 66:6 128:9,17 181:13 glad 90:11 GM 43:17,18,21,24 44:11 go 8:3 13:6 20:11 25:11 28:15 30:10 36:16 37:6 38:6,8 39:19 40:19 43:18 43:21 45:23 59:4 61:3 69:16 71:23 98:23 99:2,6 115:22 117:4 127:18 133:13 134:14 135:13,16 135:23,24,25 145:7 149:2,19 156:15 159:3 164:14,17 171:8,8 goals 88:10 goes 114:17 going 8:3,5 11:3 18:22 21:23 24:3 24:14 27:8 37:23 38:4,5,6,7 39:14 40:16,24 41:25 42:14 45:8 49:16 64:12,14,15 68:15 70:18 72:14 95:2 97:6 99:11 103:17 107:1,13 113:18 117:5,22 118:23,25 125:13 126:23 132:11,13,17 134:14 135:16 137:20 151:1 159:14 162:1 165:23 169:25 188:16 good 8:2 25:13 35:24	39:8,20 40:4,12 47:12 52:3 90:11 134:22 169:11 176:13 gosh 18:25 gotten 29:11 41:1 43:3 73:18 118:19 government 86:21,22 gradual 31:24 graduate 10:15,17 11:7 12:2,17 Grand 11:15,20 12:2 12:6 gray 4:10 5:1 83:2 102:2,6,10,23 103:16,19 122:2,5 124:1,19 153:1,9 155:14 156:8 184:10 185:17,18 186:3,17 187:11 greater 26:10 green 101:1 grievance 26:18 30:9 32:13 group 80:20 88:7 grouped 24:8 grouping 77:25 guess 13:21 28:14 76:17 88:20 168:12 180:13 guideline 82:22,24 83:1,4,7,8,12 85:11 168:2 Guidelines 3:19 82:17	happened 21:21 31:18,20,22 36:5 37:8 46:13 51:13 66:8 133:4 146:12 146:17 153:13 154:1 170:4 172:21 happening 98:4,7,11 163:22 170:10 happens 30:12 41:24 42:18 46:3 169:4,6 happy 11:17 harassment 81:1 hard 48:11 head 8:15 10:24 41:7 84:18 106:15 headers 92:23 headings 94:22 hear 11:17 110:17 heard 23:20 27:3 150:20 hearing 116:22 held 167:2 hell 152:8 help 9:9 35:18 36:10 41:5 45:8 61:9 81:23 82:4 158:20 165:2 hey 37:7 88:23 119:20 151:4 160:13 187:19 high 10:14,17 11:6,8 76:18 higher 17:2 37:6 hired 22:15,16 hiring 26:1,8,9 89:4 history 20:16 28:24 hold 20:23 103:2 166:21 holidays 163:6 honest 14:18 hope 18:1 hot 76:8,10,19 77:18 78:1 81:24 82:1,3,5 148:18 157:2 166:15 177:5,19 178:3 181:16 183:16 184:1,6,15 184:25 185:1,3,14 hours 10:11 48:19 49:9 57:19,22 58:2 58:10,10 68:2,5	housekeeping 7:19 Howell 11:8 HR 12:1 14:11 15:4,6 15:11 16:24 17:4 20:21 21:1,5,25 22:16,19,22,25 23:2 23:5,10,12,19 24:17 25:7,8,25 26:24 27:2 28:4,6,8 29:21 30:6,20,20,24 31:7 32:11 34:21 35:16 36:9,20 38:23 39:21 40:5 41:3 44:11 50:25 52:4,5 54:21 68:19 74:23 76:12 81:3 83:17 86:2 98:4 107:12 122:10 140:21 141:4,20 142:14 148:8,10 150:4 154:25 166:22 167:8 HR-related 14:12 HR-wise 28:3 Hughes 46:23 huh-uh 8:18 97:20 160:1 161:10 human 3:18 12:5,20 12:23 14:8 15:2 20:18,25 22:11 29:14,16 33:6 38:13 70:12 73:22 hundred 42:19 43:14 hung 26:23 hurry 63:14	I IAB 2:3 icky 58:19 idea 8:21 34:4 identified 52:9 62:19 68:7 78:24 82:12 90:1 91:18 93:3 95:15 98:14 99:14 101:24 104:1 107:20 109:14 111:8 112:16 113:16 121:20 123:1,21 125:5,15 126:12 128:19 138:24 152:22
--	--	---	---	--	--	---

156:13 164:2 165:15 175:10 177:12 178:1 179:9 179:24 180:17 181:9 182:2,21 implementation 84:14,25 87:4 important 8:13 9:11 impression 39:24 40:9 improve 64:9,11 inappropriate 51:22 51:24 incident 18:24 19:3 26:21 27:4 28:9 29:4 47:6 96:6 143:5,13 145:21,22 151:6,10 175:21 incidents 147:3 173:21 174:13 include 12:6 103:19 103:21 167:19 included 15:7 23:14 119:6,14 122:9 127:3 152:1 167:18 including 183:25 184:5 inconsistencies 115:2 incorrect 111:6,19 increased 33:3 indefinitely 42:13 independent 74:9 155:15 187:14 INDEX 3:1,2,8 indicate 101:6,7 115:9 122:4 129:6 132:21 153:1 174:21 indicated 31:12 33:25 102:13 112:7 113:20 117:6 120:14 121:5 125:25 126:2 137:9 184:13 indicates 52:24 63:1 65:13 79:8 84:10 85:11 87:4 96:5 104:18 113:6 162:10,12 169:12 175:17 178:15,18 indicating 101:1 indication 29:1,2	individual 19:13 71:21 101:18 187:18 individualized 16:13 individually 29:1 individuals 22:4 27:10 142:13 155:20 influence 37:11,12 39:9,17 inform 124:19 information 17:17 19:7 45:17,21,23 67:18 72:12 88:3,5 88:5,9,17 100:12,13 100:17,22 139:24 148:17 149:25 150:22 151:23 155:19,20,24 157:22 158:5,18 180:7,11 185:4 186:17,18 187:3,5 187:8,21 188:3,5 informed 124:23 125:2 140:7 informing 142:19 infraction 35:4 51:19 69:21 74:6 75:10 infractions 114:23 initially 24:6 inquire 186:4 inquiry 151:25 153:9 instance 113:12 147:15,16 instances 20:2 33:14 33:20 35:20 75:21 147:20 instruct 121:8 instructed 124:17 intending 103:25 intention 25:7 interest 190:5,12,15 internal 4:9 32:22 102:1 interpretation 134:3 interpreted 85:25 interrupted 29:8 interview 19:2 20:12 129:21 158:11 171:14 interviewing 20:1,2,7 interviews 19:18	intranet 92:17,18,18 investigate 36:2 126:20 177:10 185:19 investigated 53:1 63:2,4,18 65:14,20 69:6 80:6,12,16 investigating 148:18 investigation 15:14 15:19,24 16:14,22 17:12 18:10,11 19:9 26:14 33:17 33:21 40:4 44:18 44:20,25 45:5,24 46:4,9 70:20 73:10 74:10,21 76:8 78:15,16 99:25 100:2 117:8 137:10 141:4,13,18 142:1 142:14,16 143:14 143:16 147:25 148:9 186:22 187:14 188:2 investigations 12:7 13:25 15:9 16:8,16 17:7 18:16 25:9 26:17 46:2 76:11 78:18 80:7,10 157:10,13,22 158:19,21,22 176:23 185:6,10 investigatory 45:12 45:15,21,25 72:20 72:23 73:4 invited 18:1 involve 16:23 39:2,3 involved 17:15 28:17 34:16 39:21 44:11 44:13,17 70:15,21 86:20 98:7 101:14 101:18 157:4 159:2 166:9 170:1 178:20 involvement 26:3,6,8 26:10 33:7,12,15	70:13 183:14 involving 77:11,19 in-depth 17:5,11 in-house 26:9,11,12 29:15 30:1 184:14 111:15 116:13,14 116:16 153:3 154:4 178:19 issued 42:18 61:11 issues 15:6 29:17 35:21 italics 141:3	126:15,16,17 Kelly 2:11 10:8 kept 46:1,8,10 keyed 104:25 kin 189:15 kind 14:19 30:4 32:10 37:24 40:24 58:6 61:24 80:25 84:1,4 91:22 104:14 133:21 168:15 kinds 29:20 34:12 Kircher 6:4 165:19 165:25 166:17,18 167:6,21 168:8 169:12 170:15,19 Kircher's 167:12 knew 54:15,24 55:3,6 55:7,11 81:20 130:9 163:24 172:17,18 173:17 174:7 know 8:2 9:18 11:2 18:25 21:20 23:18 24:24 25:8,8 26:16 28:5 29:23 30:11 31:19,20 33:3 35:6 35:12 37:24,25,25 Jerrick 1:3 4:1,7 5:17 7:16 77:11 80:8 93:7 99:21 126:16 139:18,21 140:15 157:4 159:8 183:16 job 23:9 25:3,4,6 50:7 63:20 64:13 Joel 1:10 190:21 Johnny's 28:23 join 17:19 journal 69:13 93:10 93:12,13,14,14,16 93:17,19,20,22,23 98:19 129:8,12,14 129:17 Judicial 189:19 jumping 100:4	J J 1:3 98:19 James 4:3 5:8 January 50:18 68:16 69:21 106:21 123:24 125:8,18 139:4 153:8 169:13 178:19 issued 42:18 61:11 issues 15:6 29:17 35:21 italics 141:3
--	---	--	---	--	---

132:1,10,24 135:7 137:17 138:5,14,16 140:1,2,7,17 142:5 142:6 143:12,24 144:6,21 145:14,15 146:15,15 148:5,16 148:21,24 149:1,10 149:11 150:2,3,13 152:13,14 154:11 156:1,2,3,6 158:8 158:12 160:8,14 162:1,2,5,7 163:12 166:14 168:18 169:2,4,9,22 170:2 172:23 173:19 174:12 184:11,17 185:21,22,25 188:1 188:6 knowledge 53:11 73:6 80:19 85:7 88:18,20 97:10 108:18,19 110:15 124:15 140:9,11,17 155:12,18,21 176:19,21 177:11 185:20 186:4,8,20 186:24 187:3,9,10 187:15,16 known 22:5 54:23 57:20 65:5 79:24 80:5,11 154:15 knows 123:20 Kotula 96:6,11 100:23 101:7 158:6 171:21 Kotula's 157:14 Kriksciun 4:3 5:8 97:12,14,15 105:16 125:8 Kronos 45:11 72:19 108:10,12,13,21,25 143:8,9 144:3 145:20	L La 4:19,21 5:5 44:4,7 64:5 96:5 97:19 98:17 99:2,6 100:21 101:5,19 102:19 103:8,18 109:17 110:25 111:5,11,14 112:19	112:24 117:6,11 119:5 120:14,22 121:8,17 123:25 124:18 127:4,8 128:6,14 129:1,7,22 130:13 137:9,25 140:5,23 157:16 152:12,16 163:15 164:1 165:16 171:15 172:1 173:16 174:1 175:1 176:1 177:16 177:1 178:1 178:1 179:1 179:1 180:1 180:1 181:1 181:1 182:1 182:1 183:1 183:1 184:1 184:1 185:1 184:1 186:1 186:1 187:1 187:1 188:1 188:1 189:1 189:1 190:1 190:1 191:1 191:1 192:1 192:1 193:1 193:1 194:1 194:1 195:1 195:1 196:1 196:1 197:1 197:1 198:1 198:1 199:1 199:1 200:1 200:1 201:1 201:1 202:1 202:1 203:1 203:1 204:1 204:1 205:1 205:1 206:1 206:1 207:1 207:1 208:1 208:1 209:1 209:1 210:1 210:1 211:1 211:1 212:1 212:1 213:1 213:1 214:1 214:1 215:1 215:1 216:1 216:1 217:1 217:1 218:1 218:1 219:1 219:1 220:1 220:1 221:1 221:1 222:1 222:1 223:1 223:1 224:1 224:1 225:1 225:1 226:1 226:1 227:1 227:1 228:1 228:1 229:1 229:1 230:1 230:1 231:1 231:1 232:1 232:1 233:1 233:1 234:1 234:1 235:1 235:1 236:1 236:1 237:1 237:1 238:1 238:1 239:1 239:1 240:1 240:1 241:1 241:1 242:1 242:1 243:1 243:1 244:1 244:1 245:1 245:1 246:1 246:1 247:1 247:1 248:1 248:1 249:1 249:1 250:1 250:1 251:1 251:1 252:1 252:1 253:1 253:1 254:1 254:1 255:1 255:1 256:1 256:1 257:1 257:1 258:1 258:1 259:1 259:1 260:1 260:1 261:1 261:1 262:1 262:1 263:1 263:1 264:1 264:1 265:1 265:1 266:1 266:1 267:1 267:1 268:1 268:1 269:1 269:1 270:1 270:1 271:1 271:1 272:1 272:1 273:1 273:1 274:1 274:1 275:1 275:1 276:1 276:1 277:1 277:1 278:1 278:1 279:1 279:1 280:1 280:1 281:1 281:1 282:1 282:1 283:1 283:1 284:1 284:1 285:1 285:1 286:1 286:1 287:1 287:1 288:1 288:1 289:1 289:1 290:1 290:1 291:1 291:1 292:1 292:1 293:1 293:1 294:1 294:1 295:1 295:1 296:1 296:1 297:1 297:1 298:1 298:1 299:1 299:1 300:1 300:1 301:1 301:1 302:1 302:1 303:1 303:1 304:1 304:1 305:1 305:1 306:1 306:1 307:1 307:1 308:1 308:1 309:1 309:1 310:1 310:1 311:1 311:1 312:1 312:1 313:1 313:1 314:1 314:1 315:1 315:1 316:1 316:1 317:1 317:1 318:1 318:1 319:1 319:1 320:1 320:1 321:1 321:1 322:1 322:1 323:1 323:1 324:1 324:1 325:1 325:1 326:1 326:1 327:1 327:1 328:1 328:1 329:1 329:1 330:1 330:1 331:1 331:1 332:1 332:1 333:1 333:1 334:1 334:1 335:1 335:1 336:1 336:1 337:1 337:1 338:1 338:1 339:1 339:1 340:1 340:1 341:1 341:1 342:1 342:1 343:1 343:1 344:1 344:1 345:1 345:1 346:1 346:1 347:1 347:1 348:1 348:1 349:1 349:1 350:1 350:1 351:1 351:1 352:1 352:1 353:1 353:1 354:1 354:1 355:1 355:1 356:1 356:1 357:1 357:1 358:1 358:1 359:1 359:1 360:1 360:1 361:1 361:1 362:1 362:1 363:1 363:1 364:1 364:1 365:1 365:1 366:1 366:1 367:1 367:1 368:1 368:1 369:1 369:1 370:1 370:1 371:1 371:1 372:1 372:1 373:1 373:1 374:1 374:1 375:1 375:1 376:1 376:1 377:1 377:1 378:1 378:1 379:1 379:1 380:1 380:1 381:1 381:1 382:1 382:1 383:1 383:1 384:1 384:1 385:1 385:1 386:1 386:1 387:1 387:1 388:1 388:1 389:1 389:1 390:1 390:1 391:1 391:1 392:1 392:1 393:1 393:1 394:1 394:1 395:1 395:1 396:1 396:1 397:1 397:1 398:1 398:1 399:1 399:1 400:1 400:1 401:1 401:1 402:1 402:1 403:1 403:1 404:1 404:1 405:1 405:1 406:1 406:1 407:1 407:1 408:1 408:1 409:1 409:1 410:1 410:1 411:1 411:1 412:1 412:1 413:1 413:1 414:1 414:1 415:1 415:1 416:1 416:1 417:1 417:1 418:1 418:1 419:1 419:1 420:1 420:1 421:1 421:1 422:1 422:1 423:1 423:1 424:1 424:1 425:1 425:1 426:1 426:1 427:1 427:1 428:1 428:1 429:1 429:1 430:1 430:1 431:1 431:1 432:1 432:1 433:1 433:1 434:1 434:1 435:1 435:1 436:1 436:1 437:1 437:1 438:1 438:1 439:1 439:1 440:1 440:1 441:1 441:1 442:1 442:1 443:1 443:1 444:1 444:1 445:1 445:1 446:1 446:1 447:1 447:1 448:1 448:1 449:1 449:1 450:1 450:1 451:1 451:1 452:1 452:1 453:1 453:1 454:1 454:1 455:1 455:1 456:1 456:1 457:1 457:1 458:1 458:1 459:1 459:1 460:1 460:1 461:1 461:1 462:1 462:1 463:1 463:1 464:1 464:1 465:1 465:1 466:1 466:1 467:1 467:1 468:1 468:1 469:1 469:1 470:1 470:1 471:1 471:1 472:1 472:1 473:1 473:1 474:1 474:1 475:1 475:1 476:1 476:1 477:1 477:1 478:1 478:1 479:1 479:1 480:1 480:1 481:1 481:1 482:1 482:1 483:1 483:1 484:1 484:1 485:1 485:1 486:1 486:1 487:1 487:1 488:1 488:1 489:1 489:1 490:1 490:1 491:1 491:1 492:1 492:1 493:1 493:1 494:1 494:1 495:1 495:1 496:1 496:1 497:1 497:1 498:1 498:1 499:1 499:1 500:1 500:1 501:1 501:1 502:1 502:1 503:1 503:1 504:1 504:1 505:1 505:1 506:1 506:1 507:1 507:1 508:1 508:1 509:1 509:1 510:1 510:1 511:1 511:1 512:1 512:1 513:1 513:1 514:1 514:1 515:1 515:1 516:1 516:1 517:1 517:1 518:1 518:1 519:1 519:1 520:1 520:1 521:1 521:1 522:1 522:1 523:1 523:1 524:1 524:1 525:1 525:1 526:1 526:1 527:1 527:1 528:1 528:1 529:1 529:1 530:1 530:1 531:1 531:1 532:1 532:1 533:1 533:1 534:1 534:1 535:1 535:1 536:1 536:1 537:1 537:1 538:1 538:1 539:1 539:1 540:1 540:1 541:1 541:1 542:1 542:1 543:1 543:1 544:1 544:1 545:1 545:1 546:1 546:1 547:1 547:1 548:1 548:1 549:1 549:1 550:1 550:1 551:1 551:1 552:1 552:1 553:1 553:1 554:1 554:1 555:1 555:1 556:1 556:1 557:1 557:1 558:1 558:1 559:1 559:1 560:1 560:1 561:1 561:1 562:1 562:1 563:1 563:1 564:1 564:1 565:1 565:1 566:1 566:1 567:1 567:1 568:1 568:1 569:1 569:1 570:1 570:1 571:1 571:1 572:1 572:1 573:1 573:1 574:1 574:1 575:1 575:1 576:1 576:1 577:1 577:1 578:1 578:1 579:1 579:1 580:1 580:1 581:1 581:1 582:1 582:1 583:1 583:1 584:1 584:1 585:1 585:1 586:1 586:1 587:1 587:1 588:1 588:1 589:1 589:1 590:1 590:1 591:1 591:1 592:1 592:1 593:1 593:1 594:1 594:1 595:1 595:1 596:1 596:1 597:1 597:1 598:1 598:1 599:1 599:1 600:1 600:1 601:1 601:1 602:1 602:1 603:1 603:1 604:1 604:1 605:1 605:1 606:1 606:1 607:1 607:1 608:1 608:1 609:1 609:1 610:1 610:1 611:1 611:1 612:1 612:1 613:1 613:1 614:1 614:1 615:1 615:1 616:1 616:1 617:1 617:1
--	--	---

<p>meet 10:3,6,9,12 99:1 169:7</p> <p>Melissa 84:19</p> <p>memo 4:18,20 99:17 101:13 102:1,5 103:15,19 111:10 112:19,22</p> <p>Memorandum 4:9</p> <p>memory 100:16</p> <p>mention 78:4 154:8</p> <p>mentioned 19:15 22:3 31:6 39:16 120:18 126:25 153:11 183:17</p> <p>mentions 154:4 175:23</p> <p>merged 15:22</p> <p>merger 14:20,23 21:20 22:10,20,21 22:23 23:1 24:15 25:4 31:13,18</p> <p>Merriman 26:22</p> <p>met 107:6</p> <p>method 81:8</p> <p>metro 27:8,10,16,24 28:11,18 29:6 31:1 31:4 107:1 160:10</p> <p>MI 2:4,9</p> <p>Michigan 1:1 11:9,18 12:10</p> <p>middle 139:16</p> <p>military 95:1</p> <p>million 58:5</p> <p>mind 59:12 61:6,7,25 89:19 100:4 162:18</p> <p>mine 13:12 136:24,25 166:19</p> <p>minorities 89:11</p> <p>minute 49:17 110:11 112:9 116:6</p> <p>minutes 110:14,18 112:13 115:15,18</p> <p>missing 75:12 174:2</p> <p>mistake 131:6</p> <p>misuse 67:16,19</p> <p>Mohammad 4:4,18 4:20 5:3,5 44:1 103:3</p> <p>moment 98:23 100:15</p> <p>months 69:25</p> <p>morning 8:6 9:24</p>	<p>mouth 10:25 136:1</p> <p>move 28:6 32:16</p> <p>moving 44:10 79:19</p> <p>Moyer 1:10 190:21</p> <p>MSS 104:9</p> <p>multiple 125:11 137:11</p>	<p>non-minority 153:12 153:20</p> <p>nooses 26:22</p> <p>noose-hanging 27:4</p> <p>normal 99:8,8</p> <p>normally 110:14</p> <p>Northwest 14:19 15:23 21:13 22:5,6 22:13,16 23:21,22 24:4 26:6,13,20,25 27:22 28:2,3,8 30:7 93:16 95:9</p> <p>note 99:21,22 101:13 101:17</p> <p>noted 74:1 149:7</p> <p>notes 141:24</p> <p>notice 3:10,12,15 4:7 7:20 9:3 52:13 65:10 68:10,24 69:1</p> <p>notified 98:11 131:17</p> <p>notify 34:8,13 35:5,8 35:11</p> <p>notifying 125:21</p> <p>November 48:11 49:10 50:13 59:19 62:10 69:17 96:19 100:14,18 101:11 101:11 109:12 110:2,21 111:6,19 112:3 113:3,4,22,25 114:22 115:2,6 118:13 119:5,13 120:17 127:3 133:22 137:18,18 138:10 139:20 145:22 173:21,22 173:24,25</p> <p>Now's 138:21</p> <p>number 5:23 6:6,11 6:13,18,22 32:6 38:16 86:16 89:10 95:5,7,7,9 147:3,20 156:21 159:10 163:18 169:18 175:13 178:22</p> <p>new 17:25 22:23 32:17 38:20 163:14</p> <p>Nhia 4:14 107:23</p> <p>nod 8:15 9:4</p> <p>nodding 9:3</p> <p>Nods 106:15</p> <p>nondiscrimination 84:7</p> <p>nonverbal 8:25 9:10</p>	<p>O</p> <p>object 54:12</p> <p>objecting 117:25</p> <p>objection 54:21 59:5 60:24 82:21 118:4 118:6,9 133:25 134:18</p> <p>objective 86:8,17</p> <p>objectives 85:3,12,16 85:18,22</p> <p>once 16:11 19:6 32:14 41:12 73:19 146:24</p> <p>ones 17:16 51:18 85:17,18,22 92:25</p> <p>one-sentence 139:17</p> <p>one-time 143:5,12,22</p> <p>online 81:14 91:16</p> <p>on-the-road 90:25 91:9</p> <p>open 15:8 176:1</p> <p>operation 4:11 70:24 74:5 102:15</p> <p>operational 34:17 93:2</p> <p>operations 38:24 39:4,12 74:16 75:14,21 107:17 122:15</p> <p>opportunities 64:7,8</p> <p>opportunity 15:16 33:4 39:3 63:23 64:2 81:4,7 84:13 84:15,17,18,25 85:8 85:24 86:1 126:18 126:19</p> <p>OPS 122:14</p> <p>option 75:23</p> <p>order 59:11</p> <p>orderly 9:23 31:21</p> <p>organizations 25:12</p> <p>original 69:25 107:25 161:4</p> <p>originally 109:10</p> <p>Ortiz 131:17 132:4,8 132:14,15 133:1,6 133:21 134:25</p> <p>outside 14:5 29:21 45:17 72:2 78:10 86:5 160:9 175:5 187:7</p>
--	---	---	---

overlook 9:9	parties 189:16	46:18 54:21 57:14	113:17,18 121:21	position 20:17,23
overseeing 25:25	190:18	58:9 59:12 75:4	123:2,22,23 125:6	32:17,19,23 33:1,2
184:15	parts 30:8 159:19	76:13 80:20 81:17	125:16 126:13	67:9,14 107:12
oversight 23:11	party 161:2 190:11	83:19 95:8 106:2	128:20 138:25	127:14,20 161:8
25:18 120:17	190:11,13,14	123:18 145:7	152:23 156:14	166:21 167:3
130:19,22 137:20	paste 129:22	161:14 162:11	164:3 165:16	possible 18:19 35:22
137:23 138:4	patient 38:11	163:21 175:18	175:11 177:13	possibly 116:20,24
overview 15:10	pay 30:13 48:19 49:8	190:8	178:2 179:10,25	posting 32:23
P				
P 1:10 190:21	50:3,11 56:16,22,25	personal 140:9,11,17	180:18 181:10	post-high 11:11
PACE 115:24 116:7	57:20,21 58:1,11,14	personally 36:15	182:3,22	post-merger 29:10
package 45:15	58:22 59:18,25	personnel 3:19,21	plan 30:12,14 61:7	potential 19:4
114:19	61:12 65:5 68:5	46:1 82:16 90:12	87:5,6,8,12,15,16	potentially 19:5
packet 45:12	135:8 144:9 146:6	90:13,16	89:5	35:20 83:9
page 3:6 4:25 5:25	146:7,23 156:2	person's 58:1	plans 30:15	practice 39:6 163:7
68:14,16,22 69:10	172:22	perspective 15:11	play 33:11	practices 3:18,21
69:12 83:21,24	payroll 26:11 29:18	phone 28:22 123:16	please 7:13 9:18	90:13,14,16 163:21
84:6 96:4 126:23	29:24 32:1,12	150:15 185:22	35:14,15 109:18	163:22
139:16,17 150:24	137:11	186:16	117:21 135:5	practicing 38:14
151:1	PC 2:8 189:22,23	PHR 13:6,10,14 14:6	181:12	predictable 92:8,12
pages 189:10	peer 166:19,20	phrase 64:4 92:25	PLLC 2:3	premises 130:18
paid 54:4,11 56:6	peers 153:20	phrased 134:6	Plymouth 2:4	preparation 13:14
59:8 66:21 135:16	people 23:16 27:6,7	phrasing 121:9	PL's 43:6	present 16:1,6 19:18
136:9,11,11,13	34:16,19,22 41:2	physically 127:23	point 9:1,17 12:9	26:17 42:17
paper 63:9 119:7	80:20 91:17 92:20	166:25	13:9 23:2 36:11	presentation 16:7
128:4	92:24 158:11,11	pick 27:19	39:1,8 48:16,17	presented 43:13,15
papers 128:10	160:14 185:8	picking 9:4	62:3 65:4 68:20	presenter 16:4
paragraph 52:25	perceived 114:23	piece 61:21 119:7	84:12 86:20 110:1	president 105:14
65:15 69:11 79:11	percent 42:19 43:14	pieces 61:20	111:23 114:13	presume 11:3
80:24 84:11 86:19	83:11,14	pile 165:2	118:12,22 119:3	pretty 31:14,21 50:3
96:4 117:7 129:20	Perdue 165:19	pilots 31:4	129:15,23 130:21	156:16
139:17,18 142:11	performance 3:10,13	PL 41:8,12,20,23	130:25 131:1,3	previous 77:13,22
154:2	3:15 15:22 40:7	42:5 43:4,11 44:10	138:7,11,16,19	97:17 157:10,12
parentheses 140:19	63:20,22 64:1,2,6,8	45:2 47:5,15 71:7	158:13 163:12	185:5,6,10
parking 114:5	64:9,11,13,17,25	72:14 131:17	171:6	previously 174:23
part 45:5,11,14 48:15	65:6,10 68:11 69:2	132:12 133:16	175:2	175:2
48:20 49:4,10 67:1	93:18 127:11,16	136:7 137:4	pre-merger 29:10,11	
67:5,24 70:19	performed 23:9	place 9:12 14:20	primarily 85:1	
87:25 88:2 102:7	80:10	32:15 34:3,5,9,14	principal 190:9	
126:17,21 138:4	period 21:4 44:2	39:10 42:8 46:19	printed 108:17	
146:12 163:4,5	108:12 136:11,13	49:23 52:1,7 60:8	prior 9:21 10:4 20:23	
174:2	145:17 162:24	74:25 75:6,12,15	21:12 22:6,9 25:3	
participant 16:3	163:2,8,9,10	94:1 140:8 144:19	29:12 37:15 50:13	
particular 19:15 34:7	permission 53:10,12	158:19,21,23	108:18 117:1	
34:10 36:5 39:13	54:1,4,9 55:14,17	placed 129:8 141:7	privy 26:23	
41:20 46:11 51:12	55:21 66:3,6,10	Plaintiff 1:3 2:2	probably 13:21 16:10	
73:10 74:1 88:20	133:7,12,16,22	Plaintiff's 3:9 52:10	58:6 81:25 86:14	
89:6 103:15 104:16	134:7 135:1,23	62:20 68:8 78:25	145:4 170:8	
112:22 169:21	136:3,8,9,17 137:2	82:13 90:2 91:19	probe 21:19	
176:6 178:10	146:2,6 170:16	93:4 95:16 98:15	problem 24:23 37:7	
182:12	person 17:18 18:18	99:15 101:25 104:2	38:12 110:6,10,20	
	20:8,9 22:5 27:2	107:21 109:15	112:8 117:2 118:13	
	28:5,9 40:5 41:3	111:9 112:17	problematic 110:22	

procedure 7:22 34:24	115:16,19	136:16,16,18,22,23	reality 130:17	139:4 141:3 149:1
procedures 30:22	punch 57:11 95:25	144:20 147:12	really 22:23 33:23	149:24 150:2,3,20
proceed 9:23	96:6 110:3,7 112:5	171:20 174:11	35:24 38:19 43:8	153:10 158:13
Proceedings 3:1	115:24	questioned 129:21	60:6 118:19 137:7	161:6 162:9,22
73:15 138:22	punched 48:14,19	questions 8:5,7 26:12	150:22 151:1	187:5 188:5
188:23	49:3,9 50:4,11	30:17 32:1,4,5,7	168:19	receiving 147:25
process 9:19 14:4	53:12,16 55:7,17	40:13,14,17 60:13	42:1 68:4 74:4	150:21 176:5
15:22 16:17,20	56:1,22,23,24 58:2	62:22 74:18 149:9	88:17 98:3 102:14	recess 73:15 138:22
17:9 18:9,11,15,17	58:9 66:3,10,18	171:13 172:13	102:15 105:18	recognize 10:23 60:6
26:4,7,15,18 29:10	67:4,23 101:2	173:4,10 183:9	162:23 163:4	recollection 53:9
30:9 31:14,16	133:13 135:15	185:1,15 187:25	7:21 56:21	77:17,21 78:11
32:13 37:24 38:22	146:22 154:12	188:13 189:6	57:1 123:17,19	128:8 129:2
39:10 44:9 73:23	159:9	question's 21:12	145:25	recollections 20:10
102:8,9 106:22	punches 45:11 72:19	quick 156:15	reassignment 94:17	recommend 74:14,14
163:5 170:17,25	108:2,6,16,17,21,21	quite 10:25 13:22	Rec 105:24	recommendation
processes 39:22	108:25 109:12,19	38:17 89:21	recall 12:8 23:4 28:7	4:12 33:18 44:19
produced 148:23	109:20 111:2 143:9	quotation 130:5	29:7 44:24 45:7,13	70:23 75:15,18,22
164:11 165:1	143:10,25 144:3,23	quoted 120:14	45:16 47:14,19	76:3 102:7 104:4
181:14,15	punching 159:13	quote-unquote 85:8	51:18,19 53:6	105:25 106:2,9,18
professional 12:24	purpose 82:5,7 99:10	<hr/>	71:10,18 72:4,7,21	114:18 118:17
17:4 81:3	purposes 7:19	R	72:24 80:23 88:14	120:13
professionals 16:25	pursuant 7:4,20	R 6:3	89:18 90:19 91:2	recommendations
proffered 138:8	189:17	race 9:17 10:1 76:20	92:1,3 96:10	33:22 37:19,21
program 12:15 84:15	pursue 11:11	77:9,17 78:17,21	101:10 102:22	121:13 125:12
85:1,8	pursuing 11:24	80:12,16 88:11	103:1 109:8 111:3	recommended 74:23
prohibited 190:2	purview 30:25	152:12 157:3 172:6	113:11,14 120:12	74:24 75:5,5 103:4
promotion 32:18	put 18:5 42:6,13 46:1	172:19 177:4	120:20 121:11,14	103:8 131:11
33:4	74:16 83:24 103:18	179:22 181:7	121:16 125:4,14	recommending 74:5
prompt 9:1	104:12,19 134:7,15	182:18 183:20,24	126:9 128:5 129:16	99:12 102:16
pronounce 97:13	135:1,7 136:1,17,19	184:1,4,11,17	129:18 131:9,14	105:19 117:12
property 59:9,10,13	137:2	185:11,14	138:12 141:14	record 7:13 8:11,12
59:14,19 60:3	puts 140:19	races 172:10	142:15,17,19 143:6	9:11,13 13:5 21:24
protected 183:25	putting 61:18,19	racial 28:17 29:3,4	144:14,18 151:12	46:1 47:1
184:5	116:5	77:5	151:16,17,20 152:9	records 18:25 100:1
protocol 99:9	p.m 1:14 138:22,23	raising 183:25	152:20 156:10,12	121:1,10 137:11
provide 33:22 39:4	178:7 179:13	ramp 23:15	159:14,23 160:2	recruiting 29:19
73:24 141:12	180:22 182:6	ran 44:24	168:11 170:14	Redford 2:4
153:25 189:24	188:23	range 76:15	175:2 176:5 187:24	redirect 117:21
190:7	<hr/>	rare 39:7	recalling 131:22	reduced 50:20 51:4
provided 7:3 45:18	rates 190:17	rates 190:17	51:17 70:3,9 189:7	51:17 70:3,9 189:7
55:20 73:1 87:13	quarterly 16:10	reach 30:25 31:2,8	47:3,4 64:18 74:11	reduction 52:6
100:18 109:1	question 8:22 9:20,21	reaching 40:4	87:19 148:1 149:1	reference 178:11,12
138:17 139:24	10:21 14:19 23:19	reaction 57:25	160:17 161:5	referenced 117:15
143:3 148:17	28:12 33:10 37:1,2	read 63:12 87:21,23	164:15 170:3	references 175:20
155:21 157:22	40:23,23 43:2 49:1	87:25 88:22,24	178:22 179:16	referencing 51:11
158:6 179:5 180:3	49:7 50:24 57:6	89:1 100:15 106:6	180:25 182:12	referred-to 173:8
186:19	58:17,24 59:4,4,16	149:7 168:17 173:2	received 12:16 14:6	referring 54:1 101:4
providing 96:8 174:1	59:21 60:9,12,12,15	173:7 189:8	14:16 15:3,14	140:21 148:6,8,16
published 81:9	61:2 64:22 94:10	reader 115:7	28:19,22 105:4,22	158:24 165:10,11
pull 45:17 72:25	98:9 117:20 129:9	reading 63:20 109:24	105:24 106:1	173:23,25 174:24
129:12	133:4,9,20 134:8,11	120:12 173:14	107:25 108:2,23	175:1
pulled 95:8,13	134:14,19,24	ready 21:15,19 126:7	109:7,20 129:25	reformatted 90:19

91:24	119:18	14:8 15:2 20:18,25	99:3 105:3,22	100:25 101:8
refresh 100:15	replaced 46:21	22:11 29:14,16	108:20 110:2 111:5	106:10 117:12
regard 73:25 100:13	report 5:23 6:1,6,8	33:6 70:12 73:22	122:9,14 174:24	119:10 122:9,14
111:2,6 136:5	6:11,13,15,18,20,22	resources 3:18 12:6	175:5	129:8 132:9 137:10
142:11 148:3 154:1	6:24 81:2 82:6,10	16:21 38:13	RICHARD 2:7	155:16 162:23
regarding 3:10,12,15	88:8 89:9 107:25	respect 183:13	right 23:24 31:18	186:5,23 187:14
4:7 5:17 65:10	108:1 122:5 156:21	respond 63:11	33:10 35:19 36:11	role 21:7 33:6,11
68:11 69:2 95:25	160:5 161:21,24	110:25 151:13	36:13,17 57:3 59:3	34:1 35:16 70:12
99:21 102:3 126:15	162:9,22 164:5	164:23	71:16 72:8 84:11	70:16 73:21 105:13
144:16 148:9,13	165:2 177:7,7	responded 151:18	91:3,4,6 97:13	168:20
160:5 188:1	178:3,22 179:4,12	160:4,4 167:23	107:8 111:23 115:3	role's 70:18
regular 92:8,12	181:18 182:6,9,13	183:6	120:1 126:1 128:12	rolled 90:24 91:13
Regulations 7:5	182:25	responding 166:8	132:1 134:17	room 8:19 9:13 83:9
189:18 190:4	reported 89:3 162:16	177:19	138:15 150:5	roughly 110:18
related 16:23 18:24	175:18 179:13	response 9:2,10 30:5	164:12 168:19	RTS 48:2,5 49:19
19:3 22:24 23:12	180:22 189:5	151:14,25 153:6,8	170:12 174:11	52:21 55:10 154:9
29:18 30:6 157:7	reporter 1:10 7:3 8:8	157:23 158:14	187:18 188:22	rules 7:5,22,22 30:21
relationship 190:5,10	9:4 173:7 188:16	164:16,18 165:5	189:8	91:11 118:5 189:18
relative 88:11	188:19,22 189:1,21	167:25 169:3 173:3	risk 39:1	190:3
relatively 22:23	190:22	173:20 174:13	Road 2:4 91:11	run 41:13 42:14
156:15	reporting 5:22 6:6,10	177:3,23 179:4,7	robust 94:13	running 41:16
reliability 3:22,24	6:13,17,22 7:6	180:3 181:17,24	Rod 98:20	131:18 132:6
90:5 92:15	80:25 82:8 88:6	182:25 188:10	rode 110:17	Ryan 2:11 17:20
reliable 92:13	99:25 156:19	responses 8:14 9:1	<hr/>	S
relocate 33:1	166:15 175:13	responsibilities 26:1	S 94:21 173:21	
relying 118:2	176:6 180:21 181:1	29:14 31:15 73:25	safe 17:3 77:16 85:21	
remain 66:3 69:13	182:5 189:19,22,23	168:16	safety 35:4 64:15	
remained 22:19,25	189:25 190:8	responsibility 33:3	Saginaw 11:16	
remaining 53:12 56:1	reports 165:3 181:15	167:7,13,22 168:9	sake 134:5	
remember 45:4	181:16	responsible 25:25	Sarsour 4:4,19,21 5:3	
47:16,18 71:13,15	represent 113:19	28:1,2 29:15 30:20	5:5 44:1 97:15	
78:14 91:10 92:24	189:11	30:24 84:13 166:14	103:3 111:12	
109:23 119:8,9	representation 32:14	results 33:17	112:20 123:4,13,25	
120:19,20 125:13	representative 26:16	retaliate 184:3	124:18 159:2	
128:17 131:15	26:24	retaliated 183:23	171:25 172:8	
132:3 138:12 140:5	represented 23:22	retention 89:5	satisfactory 89:10	
142:22 143:7	68:1	retirement 32:1	saw 71:4 89:9 91:7	
144:19 152:11	representing 54:14	returned 128:2	101:22	
169:17,24 170:9,10	57:3 134:4,12	reversed 76:3,4	saying 28:22 40:5	
170:12	request 108:5,18	review 17:14 51:22	43:17 49:12 53:24	
remembered 132:18	145:12 150:6	74:2,2 88:15 89:6	63:9 66:8 77:24	
remembrance 71:16	157:23 170:18	109:2 163:4 167:11	131:4,23 132:1,4	
89:8,16 111:1	171:4 183:14	168:13 169:8	135:14 141:21,25	
remove 49:19 52:21	requested 52:20	reviewed 44:18,21	144:9 145:14 150:4	
removed 48:2 52:1	109:1 140:20 145:1	45:6,22 88:2	153:10 160:13	
54:25 55:9	169:23 170:15	reviewing 70:22	says 8:11 48:25 63:25	
removing 48:6 154:8	171:3 175:7	183:14	65:1 67:21 69:1,5	
repeat 28:12 43:2	require 33:1	reviews 42:16	79:20 81:2 82:21	
59:21 61:3 64:22	requires 102:10	Re-Examination 3:5	84:12,21,24 85:1	
67:3 98:9	reserve 188:17	184:22	86:20,24 90:12	
repeated 15:25	resolved 82:9	re-quote 129:19	91:8,17 94:9,10,11	
rephrase 61:19	resource 12:20,23	RFT 4:12 98:19,24		

94:16,18,20 99:21 104:9 105:3 112:4 113:25 115:23 117:19 129:25 130:13 139:4,18 141:2,20 142:4,12 148:14 149:5 151:4 159:8,12 162:6,12 162:15 165:24 174:22 177:16 scale 30:14 school 10:14,18 11:6 11:8,11 scratched 119:7 127:4 139:20 scratching 128:3,9 140:6 se 80:11 search 81:20 seat 35:3 40:1 second 52:24 65:15 69:11,12 84:6 86:4 96:4 104:9 126:23 128:12 139:15 seconds 113:8,25 115:6,16 116:5 secret 132:11 section 16:5 sections 84:2,3 security 16:24 see 8:20 9:13 16:9 17:25 18:23 19:4 41:24 52:14 63:8 65:9,11,16 68:12,16 68:25 69:3,6,11,14 72:19,22 74:6 82:17 83:21,25 84:7 85:3 87:11 88:22 90:5 93:7,22 93:24 95:19 96:1,8 98:20,24 99:18 100:25 104:5 109:18 110:3 111:12 112:5,20 113:8,24 114:1 115:7,25 121:2 122:2,10 123:5 124:1 129:12 137:13 139:5,10,22 141:9 147:10 151:14,24 152:17 153:4 154:5 156:19	156:22 162:14,17 164:6,12,14 165:19 165:23 175:13 178:4,7 179:14 180:23 182:6 seeing 71:2 92:1,3 129:16 143:7 seeking 102:13 seemingly 151:7 seen 33:17 52:5,16 57:10 79:5 84:22 87:3,6,8 108:15 114:10 139:7 156:24 160:16 164:8 self-service 104:11 self-study 13:15 send 102:5 109:11,19 123:12,19 142:13 142:14 160:12 170:17 sending 102:14,17 125:11 142:15 167:5 sends 97:20 senior 20:18,21 21:1 83:19 105:4,7 107:9 sense 10:21 76:18 93:13 119:12,19 120:4,5,7,9 133:9 164:25 sent 74:17 97:22,23 102:10 109:9 111:5 111:25 114:19,24 140:22 141:25 148:2,10,21 149:4,5 149:11,11 174:23 175:2 sentence 52:25 65:15 85:6 87:4 99:20,24 separate 24:9 30:13 30:14 31:7 157:18 176:2 186:22 separated 167:15,16 Seppings 84:19 September 20:22,24 21:9 series 8:5 service 23:13,14 25:21 31:10 32:2,3 107:19 124:7	services 189:25 190:8 set 38:17 62:22 80:7 91:22 Sheandra 6:3 165:18 166:11 167:10 169:23 171:5 184:13 sheet 83:22 108:1 116:7 shift 48:15,20 49:4,10 49:24 50:3,13 53:14,18 54:6 56:24,25 57:11 61:12 62:10 67:1,5 67:24 116:8 119:17 146:12 174:3 short 102:20,24 103:4,9 shortly 96:19 103:17 165:9 show 99:12 103:17 165:14 showing 150:1 SHRM 13:1,5,17,24 side 8:16,16 38:24 39:12 74:16 75:14 75:22 sideways 127:21 sign 133:7 188:18,20 189:9 signature 69:16,25 112:24 188:17 signed 69:17,20 99:18 similar 25:7,10 49:7 62:21 sink 118:18 site 92:17 sitting 56:20 57:24 58:4,7,13 67:17 77:16 152:19 173:19 174:12 situation 18:12 39:14 57:19 58:7,8 146:1 146:10 152:6 158:10 172:15 173:12 186:5 situations 80:21 six 58:10 77:25 78:8 166:1 169:22 170:3 183:16 184:25 185:13 188:9	80:15 87:18 132:19 151:20 187:24 speculate 134:21 148:22 SPHR 13:7 spite 114:21 spoke 129:1 185:23 spoken 8:4 104:22 105:6,15,18 staff 25:19 stage 98:8 111:4 stages 44:11,12 stamped 150:24 stand 124:6 151:7 standard 170:17,25 Standards 3:19 82:16 start 25:14 115:25 116:6,8,15 130:14 153:7 started 119:17 134:13 151:4 starts 129:20 150:24 154:3 State 11:15 189:2 stated 189:5 statement 18:21 19:12 47:3,9,11 149:22 154:1 statements 40:3 44:22 71:5 98:19 163:16 174:22 175:1 states 1:1 107:24 110:2 stating 7:13 135:6 138:5 station 55:15,18,25 66:4,11 105:7 154:13 156:5 statistical 88:16,16 stay 8:17 24:21 54:4 66:18 133:13 135:15 stayed 24:7,11,19 step 30:2 steps 101:15 Stewart 2:8 stick 136:19 stop 59:3 81:25 94:5 story 156:6 stuck 89:13,19 study 11:23 12:5
---	--	---	--

stuff 75:12 137:21 151:15 subjects 14:12 submitted 115:25 121:1,9 subsequent 70:20 substance 170:11 substantiate 19:8 101:8 substantiated 19:21 Suite 2:8 summary 44:23 45:1 47:5,8,13,15,17,20 47:22 71:7,8,11,13 71:15,17,19 72:9,13 100:12 101:18,20 101:21 141:4,13 142:1,14,16 147:25 148:8,13,14,20 150:14,14 supervision 141:17 supervisor 56:11 supplement 150:6 support 4:22 33:19 74:8 98:20 102:18 105:21 149:22 supporting 102:16 supportive 74:6 sure 8:3 13:12 14:11 40:2 43:23 58:20 58:23 63:12 64:24 66:20 67:4,18 84:19 94:8 119:19 126:5 127:16 136:21 138:2 147:14 167:13,22 168:9,14,17 186:9 suspended 104:21 108:6,10 159:9,13 159:25 suspension 104:17,19 104:23,25 106:11 106:14,20 130:1 162:24 163:6 swipe 110:2,7,12 112:4 113:6 114:7 swiped 113:13 114:14 117:1 swipes 45:14 72:22 109:4,5,5 113:20 114:10 143:8,9 144:1,4,4,23 145:1	145:12,13,16,19 sworn 7:8 189:14 system 19:16 52:22 93:18 94:13 104:12 T table 9:21 take 8:9 11:2 13:13 13:16 18:6 19:9 25:1 34:3 36:5 42:24 55:12 58:1 71:24 74:25 75:6 taken 1:9 7:20 19:23 21:12 29:21 34:13 43:4 57:12,22 75:18 96:24 takes 44:5 56:24 110:11 112:8 talk 14:15,23 18:9 20:15 25:15,17 31:21 41:4 49:14 96:18 97:6 132:14 140:22 150:21 158:11 talked 29:12 43:7,11 71:1,3,4 140:3 160:13 187:11 talking 38:1 52:20 64:19 76:25 77:3 78:8 80:9 130:4 137:20 138:9 140:14 145:22 157:13 161:14 166:5 170:12 177:3 177:6,6 179:6 talks 80:25 tardy 116:18 task 100:25 teacher 16:4 teaching 38:19 team 35:23 167:8,14 167:14 technically 14:21 tell 10:20 15:2 18:15 23:8 26:5 31:15 47:7,14,17 51:10,15 55:13 66:17 85:17	87:14 100:21,24 116:17 122:20 126:9 128:16,25 133:3 144:8 151:5 158:20 160:24 161:1,2 166:20 169:14,16 telling 29:9 128:8 132:12,16 tells 140:10 template 164:23 165:4,8,11,12 166:1 166:3,8 167:6 174:21 177:19,23 179:3,6 180:2,3,6 181:12,19,20,23 182:24,25 183:5 templates 180:7 183:4,6 ten 76:16,21 tend 8:25 tends 97:19 tension 29:3 term 64:6 74:5 91:5 91:15 102:8 105:24 terminable 174:9,20 terminate 76:3 terminated 79:25 122:24 141:6,8,9 142:5,7,9,11,20 173:20 174:8,13 terminating 70:14 termination 4:12 26:2 70:21,22,23 73:19,23 74:3,10,14 74:15,24,24 75:5,15 75:23 76:2,7 96:25 99:13 102:16,20,24 103:5,9 104:5 105:19,25 106:3,9 106:19 114:19 117:12 118:18 120:13 122:20 124:20,24 125:3,12 125:23 131:11 183:15 terminations 126:21 163:8 terminology 27:9 testified 7:9 24:7,19 44:5 55:1 61:14 68:3 133:11 135:21	42:9,11,19 43:14 44:1 48:9,24,24 49:2,11 50:10,19,23 50:25 52:3 53:1,3 53:18 54:8 55:23 56:7,8,18 58:16,23 58:25 59:6,8,11 60:7,10,19 61:10,16 62:6,11,18 63:2,4,5 63:18 65:14,20 66:11 67:2,6,10,14 69:6,12 74:22 75:25 89:22 96:8 100:1 105:9 106:25 107:13 108:22 110:12 116:6,8,15 116:19 117:9,13 118:16 119:15,16 119:17 121:1,5,10 122:7,10,17,21,24 128:1 130:14 133:8 133:15,23 134:9 135:1,3,8,9,12 136:4,8,17,19 137:2 137:3,11 145:17,20 146:15 155:4 158:25 159:25 160:18 162:24 163:3 166:18 168:2 168:10 174:8 184:9 185:3 timely 167:9,23,25 times 21:7 76:16 170:5 timing 131:9 title 21:6,20 22:9,22 23:2,4 24:12,13,16 68:25,25 84:20 124:4 127:17 titled 3:19,21 4:1 today 7:18 50:13 56:20 57:24 58:4,7 58:13,15 63:3,14 67:17 68:1 70:2,5 77:16 98:23 103:12 114:11 139:8 150:10 152:19 173:19 174:12 179:7 181:21 today's 7:19 10:4 told 62:4 64:5 84:4 115:1 119:12,20
--	--	---	---

121:17 125:22	189:12	153:1 154:19	uses 64:5	83:22 99:6 130:7
126:1,4,5,10 127:1	treated 153:18,19,23	169:13,25 184:10	usual 190:16	140:16 151:3 156:9
127:2 132:5 135:14	172:5,9 178:16	type 32:1,12 77:1,3,6	utilize 39:11	wants 40:19 153:18
139:19 140:4,11	treatment 155:17	types 32:7 93:1	utilized 94:3	warrant 58:8
143:19 144:7,10,12	171:18	typical 123:12	utilizing 94:5	wasn't 24:16 40:2
144:22 145:15	tricky 14:19	typically 18:21 19:11		55:7 56:17,19
154:16,17 156:8	true 36:20 63:21	34:15 42:16 43:14		61:17,20 63:4
160:23 172:22	179:5 189:11	163:13 169:17		67:14 90:18 94:13
188:10	try 9:1 35:14,15 37:1			106:20 107:3
tolerate 79:21	47:23 61:8 64:7,9			116:21,23 118:22
Tolerated 79:20	82:8 101:8			119:25 120:10
tomorrow 28:23	trying 28:14 39:5			124:25 130:9,17
top 152:7	52:4 76:18 88:21			132:11 136:15
topic 34:11 169:22	119:1 133:3			168:20 174:5,8,12
170:3	turn 68:14,15 69:10			way 9:22 10:24 12:20
topics 4:1 34:12	96:3 137:6 139:15			16:12 18:5 25:10
77:22 78:15 93:6	turned 101:1			28:24 37:8 38:17
Torre 4:19,21 5:5	turning 130:14			41:22 55:6 59:4
44:4,7 64:5 97:19	Tuyn 2:7 3:5 8:3,10			66:8 71:12 92:1
98:17 99:2,6	10:7 21:11,16			108:16 109:22
100:21 101:5,19	23:18,25 24:3,18			134:6 136:24
102:19 103:8,18	40:12,16,19,22 47:2			180:11 183:18
109:17 110:25	54:12 55:1 58:24			186:2
111:5,11,14 112:19	60:9,14,19 63:11			Wayne 145:8,13
117:6,11 119:5	64:19 71:23 72:3			ways 65:4
120:14,22 121:8,17	73:14 77:23 78:4,7			week 163:13
123:25 124:18	82:21 117:15,18,24			weeks 8:20
127:4,8 128:6,14	118:2,7 133:24			weigh 38:6
129:1,7 130:13	134:6,9,17,20			welcome 100:15
137:9,25 140:5,23	135:18 136:15			128:24 162:18
158:6 159:11	138:19 140:13			went 28:20 32:14
162:20 171:16	148:5,12,25 149:10			49:22 73:20 168:22
172:4 178:11	149:15 150:5,9,13			168:25
183:15	150:17 159:5			weren't 28:1 36:3
Torre's 96:5 112:24	176:22,25 183:10			50:9 101:14 108:4
129:22 157:16	183:12 184:19			126:4 135:7
touch 141:18	188:14,18			we'll 59:5 96:18
tough 58:5	Tuyn's 137:8			119:1 120:16 137:8
track 167:8	two 10:10 17:22,23			165:9
traditional 32:11	20:14 25:12 61:18			we're 9:12 16:24
train 17:1	69:24 71:20 86:14			17:16 18:22 37:23
trained 16:12,15,24	120:15 141:6,7			38:1,4,6,7 40:3
training 13:13,16,23	142:4,6,6,8,10,13			49:16 58:10 64:19
13:24 14:6,8,11,15	142:20 143:2,13			68:14 87:13 97:6
15:1,2,5,5,13,15,19	145:25 148:19			105:19 117:4
15:24 16:14 17:3,5	153:2,12,17,22			145:22 151:1 177:2
26:2	154:3 157:21			177:6,6
transaction 104:9,17	164:13 177:5			we've 23:20 43:7,11
104:19	two-and-a-half 10:11			52:20 57:2 58:25
transactions 104:13	two-day 15:5			75:9 105:6 171:9
104:14	Tyesha 4:10 5:1			174:4 179:6 181:21
transcript 8:20	102:2 122:1,20	121:17	wanted 14:5 41:4	whereabouts 101:9

white 10:2 83:1 89:24 153:17,22 wide 123:18 willing 83:20 103:2 135:13 wipe 62:3 witness 20:3,7 21:22 24:2 40:15,18,21 117:23 134:21 148:17 189:13 witnesses 8:25 19:3 19:17,19 20:1,12,13 23:20 158:10 witness's 189:8 Woodward 2:9 word 24:21 83:20 136:1 156:17 work 27:15 32:11 53:8,11 54:10 55:15,18,25 56:5,13 64:7 65:2 66:4,11 66:18 67:5 86:2 88:23 92:14 116:20 117:5 146:23 154:13 156:4 159:11,22 168:13 worked 38:13 89:21 155:1 working 9:15 10:23 14:17 27:24 28:18 29:5 34:24 48:15 48:20 49:3,10 50:12 55:8,25 56:13 59:15 67:1 67:24 118:17 145:13 146:11 154:13 workplace 79:9,16 151:9 works 88:7 152:16 world 73:18,20 worry 119:13 139:19 wouldn't 11:17 17:13 34:4 35:4 40:10 85:19 87:17 88:8 93:15 103:21 119:14,21 120:6 128:9 129:14 145:3 149:8 150:17 172:24 186:12 Wow 66:23 WPV 151:7,7	write 18:20 101:19 140:25 writing 42:6,13 189:7 written 3:15 7:3 8:11 8:12 18:20 19:12 47:3,11 50:20,21 68:10 69:3,20 113:8 116:23 wrong 60:15 115:21 116:5 159:10 161:11 wrote 101:17 Y yeah 14:4 21:14 24:2 24:18,22 27:13 28:14 42:13 43:5 46:5,7,22 55:1 57:5 58:18 59:22 64:4 65:14 71:25 75:12 77:15 78:3,6,9,12 87:24 90:15 96:14 97:5 98:10 108:1 115:1 120:5 129:24 130:2,6 132:2 136:23 138:21 144:8 145:10 147:5 149:2 151:19 154:18,20,22 156:1 169:7 170:7 174:16 174:18 187:11 year 12:17 16:11 52:6 69:24 87:13 87:19,21,23 151:6 163:11 years 11:20 12:12 13:22 17:22,23 38:14,16 Year's 163:14 yesterday 10:13 49:5 70:8 139:10 156:25 160:17 you-all 29:15 Z Zarras 105:10,12 106:2,12,13 Zarras's 105:13 Z-A-R-R-A-S 105:12 1 1 3:10 52:10,12 63:1	121 5:1 123 5:3,5 125 5:7,9 126 5:12 128 5:14 13 4:11 104:2,3 13th 95:2,14 107:2 138 5:17 14 4:13 107:21,22 14:24 113:8,13,25 1:4 14:27 110:3,7 112:4 113:7 115:6,13 116:4 14:28 110:3,8 112:5 115:24 116:6,20 117:2 119:16 130:15 133:7 134:9 135:1,8 136:17,19 137:2 15 4:16 109:15,16 15th 68:16 69:21 111:11 112:19 151:4 15-14-37(a) 190:2 152 5:19 156 5:22 159 6:13 179:12,17 180:4,15 16 4:18 111:9,10 117:6,16 120:23 121:4 137:7 16:19 130:18 135:2 3:16 111 4:18 112 4:20 113 4:22 12 4:9 94:17,17 100:12 101:25 102:1 12th 104:21,24 173:22 12-11-2012 4:4 12-13 106:7 12-15-2012 4:19,21 12-17-2012 4:6 12-18-2012 4:8,9,14 4:17 5:2 12-21-2012 5:4 12:22 138:22 12:37 138:23 12:44 109:18 17 6:17 178 6:10 179 6:12,15 18 4:22 113:17,18 18th 99:16 102:2 107:24 109:17 122:1 180 6:17 1800 95:18	181 6:19 182 6:21,24 183 3:5 184 3:5 19 5:1 121:21,23 190 3:6 189:10 1997 10:19 2 2 3:12 62:20,25 65:9 68:23 69:1,17 2-11-2013 6:4 2:29 182:6 20 5:3 76:24 123:2,3 20th 101:12 2001 11:22 12:13 2003 12:13,18 2004 12:14,18 2005 14:20 21:6,8,13 22:14 2009 14:21 15:3 2010 15:21,25 16:11 2012 44:1 48:11 49:11 50:10,13 59:19 62:10 69:18 95:3,14,18 98:18 99:17 100:19 102:2 107:2,24 109:17 111:11 122:1 139:20 145:23 173:21,24,25 2013 23:6 24:16 106:21 123:24 125:9,18 128:25 139:4 140:5 151:4 152:15,16 165:22 165:24 167:3 175:17 178:7 179:13 180:22 182:6 2014 1:13 7:1 20:22 20:24 21:9 50:19 68:17 69:22 190:19 21 5:5 123:22,23 21st 69:18 123:4 22 5:7 125:6,7 177:14 23 5:9 125:16,17 24 5:12 126:13,14 248.593.6400 2:10 25 5:14 128:20,22 25447 2:4 26 5:17 138:25 139:2
--	--	--	---

Barbara A. Franz

Rodriques v Delta Air Lines, Inc.

December 11, 2014

Page 208

27 5:19 152:23,24,24 2745 190:21 28 5:22 156:14,18 164:12,16 28th 139:4 29 6:1 164:3,4,4,13 164:16,18,22 165:8 166:4,7 171:13 29th 190:19	5 3:18 82:13,15 5th 130:14 52 3:10 53 115:6 116:5	981 2:12 99 4:7 995 6:22 182:10 183:1		
3	6			
3 3:15 68:8,10 69:2 69:20 3rd 175:16 3-20-2005 3:22 30 6:3 165:16,17 169:12 300 2:8 30320 2:13 31 6:5 175:11,12 31st 182:5 311 5:23 156:22 160:5,10 162:10 177:7 180:14 313.318.3180 2:5 32 6:8 177:13,16,17 177:18 33 6:10 178:2,3 34 6:12 179:10,11 34977 2:9 35 6:15 179:25 180:1 36 6:17 180:18,19,20 37 6:19 181:10,11,20 38 6:21 182:3,4 39 6:24 182:22,23	6 3:21 90:2,3,22 91:21 120:17 133:22 138:10 6th 137:18 6:08 178:7 61 150:24 62 3:12 660 6:6 175:13 177:7 68 3:15			
7				
32 6:8 177:13,16,17 177:18 33 6:10 178:2,3 34 6:12 179:10,11 34977 2:9 35 6:15 179:25 180:1 36 6:17 180:18,19,20 37 6:19 181:10,11,20 38 6:21 182:3,4 39 6:24 182:22,23	7 3:4,23 91:19,20 92:2,4 7.C 190:3 716 6:11 178:4,23 179:4,7 78 3:17			
8				
4 3:17 78:25 79:2 80:25 4th 152:15 165:24 4-5-2013 5:13 4-8-2013 5:15 4:40 179:13 404.773.6520 2:13 42 115:15 421 6:18 180:21 181:1,25 45 168:3,4 48009 2:9 48239 2:4	8 4:1 93:4,6 94:2,6 8th 113:4,22,25 114:22 115:2,6 118:13 119:6,13 127:3 128:4,25 137:17,18 139:20 140:4 152:15 178:7 8-25-2011 3:20 8.B 7:5 8:53 1:14 7:2 82 3:18			
9				
4 3:17 78:25 79:2 80:25 4th 152:15 165:24 4-5-2013 5:13 4-8-2013 5:15 4:40 179:13 404.773.6520 2:13 42 115:15 421 6:18 180:21 181:1,25 45 168:3,4 48009 2:9 48239 2:4	9 4:3 95:16,19 9th 123:24 125:8 153:9 179:13 180:22 9-11-28(c) 190:6 9:47 180:22 90 3:21 91 3:23 93 4:1 95 4:3 97 11:7,22 97-to-2001 12:4 98 4:5			